

protection, not several years hence when the country has generally recovered.

In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture desires immediate independence, and the Secretary of State desires independence at no time whatever.

I should perhaps apologize for taking any of the time of the Senate in discussing the letter from the Secretary of War. The Secretary of War appeared before the committee, suggested no practical substitute for the measure which we have before us, gave testimony which seemed on its face to be self-contradictory, and now presents a letter which is obviously self-contradictory. It is a very long letter, and I shall call attention to only one or two sentences in it.

Under part 1 the Secretary states:

The United States has a moral commitment before the world to give the Philippine Islands independence when the Filipino people are prepared for it and if they then desire it. The United States, of course, has the right to give the Philippines independence when they are prepared for it, whether they request it or not.

A great many people have criticized the bill because it was subject to so many different plebiscites or votes on the part of the Philippine Legislature and the Philippine people, but so far as I know this is the first time anyone has criticized the bill because we let the Philippine people have anything to say about it at all. Yet that is the only conclusion we can draw from that passage in the letter from the Secretary of War.

The Secretary criticizes section 10, which deals with the establishment of independence of the Philippine Islands during the eleventh year after the inauguration of the commonwealth government, and this is what he says:

It is considered both inexpedient and hazardous to anticipate future developments by adopting an arbitrary time-table or by specifying a definite date for ultimate independence. Qualification for independence is a condition to be achieved gradually as a result of trial and error and progressive adjustment. To say now that the Philippine Islands will be prepared for independence in a particular future year and that world conditions will then be propitious is as impossible as it is unwise.

In other words, as opposed to the position of the Secretary of State that the Philippine Islands should never have independence, and as opposed to the position of the Secretary of Agriculture that they should be allowed to go at once, the Secretary of War takes the position that we have a moral commitment to give them independence, but that we should not name a definite date because that would be inexpedient and hazardous, and that we must allow the future, which we can not foresee, to take care of itself, because possibly at some date conditions may be such that he would agree that independence might be feasible. Yet in part 3 the Secretary goes on to say:

In my annual report to you, and elsewhere, I have raised a question regarding the constitutionality of an act of Congress purporting to alienate the sovereignty of the United States over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands. It is incumbent upon me, as an official, to raise that question again. I am not convinced that the Congress and the President are without power to dispose of the Philippine Islands.

In other words, after saying that there may be some indefinite date in the future at which the Philippine Islands would be ready for independence, the Secretary apparently takes the position that there are constitutional objections which would prevent us granting them their independence at any time.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, at which time the consideration of the President's veto message on the Philippine bill shall be resumed for discussion, and that no Senator shall be permitted to speak more than once or more than 30 minutes until the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. BORAH. That is a little unfair to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CUTTING. I do not consider it so.

Mr. WATSON. I would not want to suggest anything that would be unfair to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, it is not intended, but I suspect that if such an agreement should go into effect, and the Senator from New Mexico should proceed with his speech, a number of Senators would go to dinner.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, before I consent to the unanimous-consent request, I want to suggest that if the idea is that we shall take a recess immediately after the Senator from New Mexico shall conclude, we should take the recess now, and let him conclude to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is the only fair thing to be done for the Senator from New Mexico, I think.

Mr. WATSON. If the Senator from California will permit, I intended to suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that that would be entirely proper, provided he could complete his address in 30 minutes to-morrow.

Mr. CUTTING. I think I can do so, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think we should take a recess now until 11 o'clock, and that the limitation on debate should not go into effect until the Senator from New Mexico shall have concluded his remarks.

Mr. WATSON. That is all right. I modify my request as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the modified request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered (by unanimous consent). That the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow and that after the conclusion of the address of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] no Senator may speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes upon the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

RECESS

In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 17, 1933, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in the hour of weakness and temptation, when beaten and baffled; when we perceive how vast the universe is in which we move and our thoughts are filled with wonder and puzzle; in these experiences, to know that our names are written on Thy hands is the sweetest poetry of human life. O Thou who hast revealed Thyself as eternal righteousness and eternal love, let there be in our hearts the psalm of praise and gratitude. Almighty God, Thou art the inspiration of every great movement in all the earth; Thou dost bind age to age and art the very soul of history, move upon the face of all lands and bind us to all things that run toward eternal good and are celebrated in heaven. In the name of the world's Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 14, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 5357. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Oreg.

THE DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13975) making

appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, there is at least one very important amendment on this deficiency bill, known as the McKellar amendment. I do not know at the present time whether I am opposed to this amendment or not; but as far as I am able to understand it, it is a very important amendment and is liable to cost the Government a great deal of money. I wish the chairman of the committee would give us an opportunity to express ourselves on this amendment before it is agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion it clearly involves legislation, and under the rules the legislation would have to be brought back to the House.

Mr. SNELL. That was my opinion.

Mr. BYRNS. And it will be brought back.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALDRICH. My parliamentary inquiry is with respect to the status of the McKellar amendment, inasmuch as it is, in effect, a revenue-raising measure originating in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands the amendment, merely from newspaper reports and from a casual glance at the Record, it is more in the nature of an adjustment of claims against the Treasury than a matter of raising revenue. While it affects the revenue it does so only in so far as it may authorize refunds. It is not a revenue-raising measure which would come within the constitutional provision requiring such legislation to originate in the House of Representatives.

Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNS, BUCHANAN, TAYLOR of Colorado, WOOD of Indiana, and WASON.

EMERGENCY FARM-LOAN PROGRAM AND BUSINESS RECOVERY

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Record a radio address delivered on Saturday evening by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] on Emergency Farm Legislation and Business Recovery. The justification for this insertion is not only the excellence of the address, but it will be recalled that in the very brief time the gentleman from Texas had to analyze the details and terms of the allotment plan bill, the gentleman was not permitted to explain it as fully as he would have liked, and I am informed this address goes more into detail with reference to the provisions of that measure.

Mr. SNELL. Do I understand this is an address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address delivered by Hon. MARVIN JONES, of Texas, over the Columbia network, Saturday, January 14, 1933:

Human life came from the soil. Man gets subsistence from the land. He gains strength of character from contact with the earth.

Since the days of Eden agriculture has furnished the groundwork for all progress. When a country becomes overindustrialized it is approaching the danger line.

For more than a half century agriculture in America has been the victim of a system of economic maladjustments and has been forced to stand under a steadily increasing load that favoritism in legislation and in trade practices has cast upon its shoulders.

If we look back into history we find that agriculture has been at the very rock-bottom of national stability and has been the foundation upon which civilization has been built. Nations

are great which remain rooted in the soil, and continue great only so long as this is true.

Ever since the World War America has been plunging headlong into an orgy of ill-fated prosperity, overlooking the fundamental necessities of national life, and leaving the farmer to go forward as best he could in the hasty race toward an illusive, imaginary goal. We have wandered into devious ways and have become sidetracked.

It is therefore only natural at the present time, when the race has suddenly been halted and when apprehension has taken the place of blind confidence, that leaders should turn to the farm as a road leading out of the entanglement toward the goal of recovery. The Nation has paused to think and is coming to realize that only by restoring agriculture can the rest of the country be restored.

That is why agriculture holds a prominent place in the spotlight. Its status is known. But the question of improving that status has caused wide division of opinion.

The same laws govern agriculture which govern other businesses. A balanced system is necessary for safety, and that balance has been destroyed as a result of discriminatory legislation and favoritism to other parts of the structure.

If we are to find a way out of our present plight we must look for the source of the trouble.

THE CAUSES

There are several contributing causes of the present condition of agriculture. These include a discrimination through unfair trade barriers, a discrimination in our freight-rate structure, a medium of exchange that doesn't truly measure values, a tax system that bears too heavily on the farm and ranch, and some unwise relief measures that have aggravated the situation.

Here lies the trouble and here must be found the permanent remedy, but the working out of the entire program will require time. Meanwhile, agriculture is in such desperate straits that an emergency program is necessary to relieve the immediate situation. Every thinking American knows that there can be no national recovery so long as we have 10-cent corn, 5-cent cotton, and 30-cent wheat. This is elemental.

A great many programs have been suggested—more than a score of plans are now pending in the Committee on Agriculture—the proponent of each claiming that his is the only remedy that will do the job. Even among Members of the Congress there is a wide division of opinion. Everyone agrees that something must be done, but there is great difficulty in an effort to get 435 Members of the House to agree upon any concerted action. Even those Members who are most insistent that something be done, frequently are those who most viciously attack any concrete program that is offered other than their own. The Committee on Agriculture, for this reason, has been working under tremendous difficulties.

THE ALLOTMENT PLAN

After a great deal of consideration the committee has worked out what is commonly known as the allotment plan. Many people have been consulted in its preparation. It has gone through the fires of a committee hearing. It has now passed muster in the House and is pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

The bill as passed is somewhat different from the original suggestions. It is intended solely as a temporary measure until such time as the readjustment of trade barriers, the revaluing of the unit of money, the refinancing of farm mortgages, and other parts of the permanent program can be wrought into final form.

The proposed measure was originally designed to cover only the four basic export crops of this country: Cotton, wheat, hogs, and tobacco. Since that time some other commodities have been included by the House. The prices of these four products average to-day about half what they were before the World War. Since that period, wheat has suffered a loss of approximately 65 per cent of its purchasing power, cotton 53 per cent, tobacco 19 per cent, and hogs 59 per cent.

At the same time that the farmer has had to meet these reduced prices, the taxes on agricultural lands since the pre-war period have increased approximately 150 per cent, and the farm indebtedness has increased in the same way.

The aim of the bill is to establish as a minimum price for the commodities named the same ratio to the present general commodity price level that existed during the pre-war period. In other words, to give farm prices to-day the same purchasing power measured in the terms of other commodities that they had during the period of 1909 to 1914.

RATIO PRICE

If this ratio or fair exchange value existed to-day, the price of wheat would be 93 cents per bushel and the price of cotton would be 12 cents per pound. Under the terms of the measure, these prices would apply, commencing with the period when the new harvesting season starts. The regular market would not be interfered with in any way. The farmer would merely get his certificate for an additional sum.

THE INITIAL PERIOD

For the time between now and harvest—called the initial period—the ratio price or fair exchange value would be fixed at 75 cents per bushel for wheat and 9 cents per pound for cotton; these prices to apply only to those commodities now held by the producer himself. During this period his certificate would be enough to bring his price up to the prices named.

HOW OBTAINED

The result would be obtained in this way: A processing fee would be levied upon the manufacturer of these commodities, and this fee would be equal to the difference between the prevailing price and the pre-war ratio price.

The farmer would sell his product in the regular markets, but at the time he made the sale he would be handed a certificate covering the difference between the average price his product was bringing at the time and the ratio price. This certificate would only cover that part of his commodity going into domestic consumption. He would be paid this premium only in the event he reduced his acreage as much as 20 per cent. This limitation would not apply to winter wheat which is already in the ground, but estimates indicate that due to weather conditions and reduced acreage there will be a greater average reduction even though the limitation can not apply to winter wheat.

AN ILLUSTRATION

Let us take an example applying to the initial period. Assuming that the domestic consumption of wheat is 70 per cent, 30 days after this bill takes effect, the farmer hauls 1,000 bushels of wheat to market. The prevailing market price is 35 cents per bushel. He sells his wheat for that price. He is handed a certificate for the difference between that and 75 cents (or 40 cents per bushel) covering 700 bushels, which amounts to \$280. This \$280 certificate is redeemable at the United States Treasury or other fiscal agency—one-half within 30 days and one-half within six months. In other words, the farmer, if he has complied with the requirements, would receive \$280 in addition to what he had received for his commodity in the open market. When the new harvest season starts, the full ratio price would apply.

The bill would work similarly as to cotton and tobacco.

HOGS

As to hogs, a little different method is used. The farmer would sell his hogs in the regular way, reducing his marketing tonnage 20 per cent. If he did this, he would receive a certificate covering the difference between the prevailing farm market price for hogs during the period when he sold and 5 cents per pound. Later when the regular marketing year begins, this would increase to the difference between the prevailing market price and 6 cents per pound. The farmer is now receiving about 2½ cents for his hogs. This would assure him 5 cents per pound.

The processing fee is a gradual step up, covering enough to produce the funds essential to pay the premiums.

OTHER COMMODITIES

A few other commodities were added to the bill in the House. No doubt some of these may be eliminated before the bill is finally enacted. At any rate, a somewhat similar method is provided for these commodities.

OBJECTIONS

I think it would be worth while to note some of the objections that have been made to this measure. Many of these are made by people who do not fully understand the terms of the bill.

One of these objections is that it is a gigantic sales tax. As a matter of fact, it is only a fee that is levied in sufficient amount to bring the price of these commodities up to a point where every thinking person admits they ought to be. In other words, the bill only undertakes to give these farm commodities their proper place in the present price picture. Any time the purchasers or processors of these commodities bid the price up to the minimum there will be no processing fee; there will be no benefits distributed; there will be no operation of the bill. Can anyone object to the farmer receiving the same ratio price in present-day levels that he received during the period before the World War, during and since which time a great many discriminations, trade barriers, and trade practices and favoritism in legislation have upset the fair relative prices for his commodities?

If these minimum prices were paid, the farm products mentioned would have the same exchange value, the same purchasing power measured in the terms of all other commodities in this country that they had during the pre-war period. Can any sane man object to such an adjustment?

If this can be termed a sales tax, then surely the tariff is such, because it forces the consumer to pay taxes in the form of increased prices for manufactured articles as a result of tariff protection to the manufacturers in this country.

Another objection is that it will cost the consumer more and thus increase the prices he must pay. For the sake of the argument we will assume that it would. Can anyone validly object to paying merely the price that is necessary to restore the farmer to his proper level in the whole set of commodity prices?

But, as a matter of fact, there would be very little additional cost to the consumer. Let us look at the facts as determined by Government statistics. During the pre-war period when wheat was 93 cents per bushel, the price of flour and the price of bread were almost exactly the same as the price of flour and of bread to-day. In one typical American city the price of a certain type loaf of bread was 9 cents; the price of that same loaf of bread to-day in that city is 9 cents. The price of a sack of flour in that city in 1913 is the same to the exact cent that it is to-day. Substantially the same is true of all the leading cities of America. Of course during the war period all prices went up. We are not trying to restore war prices, but merely pre-war prices.

The Government statistics further show that a bushel of wheat will produce approximately 62 loaves of bread. If the price of a bushel of wheat were increased 60 cents over the present-day price and all the increase were translated into a loaf of bread, it would make an additional cost of less than 1 cent per loaf.

Can anyone object to this much as a contribution to national prosperity, especially as it would only restore the fair exchange basis of commodities? As a matter of fact, in many instances a portion of the additional expense would be absorbed in between so that the price of the commodity would not be materially higher.

Another objection is that this measure involves price fixing. As a matter of fact it is not essentially so. It undertakes to establish a fair exchange minimum price and levy enough processing fee to bring the price up to that point on that portion of the commodity which is called the domestic percentage. It does not interfere with the market in any way. It leaves the market just as it is. It only makes the processing fee apply when the purchasers, or the processors, or the dealers, gamblers, or short sellers in a commodity have driven the price below what is its fair exchange value. Whenever they relieve the pressure or bid the price up to the ratio price, the bill is no longer applicable.

The objection has been made that we should let the law of supply and demand govern. Ordinarily this is true, and, as a long-range program, this must necessarily be done; but, in this great emergency, is the law of supply and demand operating? We have now the greatest supply of food and raw products this country has ever known, and yet millions of hungry people are walking the streets in idleness and misery. We have both the supply and the demand, but somehow the law of supply and demand is not operating. We believe that if this temporary measure is enacted it will tend to get us off dead center, start the money to flowing, and the wheels of industry to moving, and thus give the law of supply and demand a chance to become operative.

Some one has suggested that there was not enough enthusiasm in connection with the bill. Did you ever see any enthusiasm in a sick room? Did you ever watch a blood transfusion? There is no enthusiasm in connection with such an administration but it is sometimes necessary. This is an effort to administer a blood transfusion into the almost lifeless body of American agriculture. Agriculture must live if the Nation is to live. The farmer must carry on if industry is to survive. The whole complex fabric of our national life is inextricably interwoven with the future of the farm.

HOG PRICES

In the case of hog products the price of live hogs to-day is 4 cents per pound lower than in 1913 but the price of ham is higher by 7 cents a pound. Pork chops are also slightly higher. Lard and sliced bacon are lower but the percentage of decline is not as great as the decline in the price of live hogs.

As an illustration of the large difference in range between the price the farmer gets for cotton and the retail price of cotton goods it is interesting to note that doubling the present price of cotton would increase the price of voile, which now sells for 7 cents a yard, by half a cent and the price of a dollar cotton shirt by 2 cents.

The allotment bill is not intended as a panacea. It is an emergency measure and is intended to strike at the existing trouble at once. But, after emergency relief we must look for permanent restoration of principles which have been undermined and which must be rebuilt.

It is difficult to understand the vicious assaults that are made on a measure that has for its only purpose the restoring of proper price levels for the most essential of American activities. When a man grows a bushel of wheat or a bale of cotton, harvesting the one in the hot July sun, and picking the other under a blazing September sky, and carries them to market in a free country, he has—or should have—the right to sell them in his own chosen markets without the handicap of outrageous discriminations and barriers and trade practices that have heretofore borne down the price of his commodities.

BARRIERS OF TRADE

For many years the manufacturing interests of America have been working under a banner of protection. Behind the tariff wall they have prospered through the medium of increased prices, while at the same time the farmer has had very little protection. On certain commodities, which he produces in surplus quantities, no direct schedule can give him equality in any tariff system.

The farmer has been obliged to buy his supplies in a protective market, while at the same time he has had to sell his surplus commodities in a free world market. This has weakened the agricultural structure and channeled the money to the centers of America. In addition, great sums have been shipped abroad through the process of selling foreign securities to the American people.

Without discussing the merits of the tariff, for this is a non-partisan measure, all fair-minded citizens must admit that a long-time application of the practice of favoring special groups and the long-time application of the practice of discriminating against certain other groups has produced a one-sided condition in this country that has at last met itself coming back and thrown the whole field of our national life into a topsy-turvy condition.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

It is not desirable to reduce all our major crops to a strictly domestic basis any more than it is desirable to reduce our manufactured production to a strictly domestic basis; but as a distinc-

tion has been made for a series of years between the domestic part and the export part of our manufactured articles, there is no logical reason why a similar distinction should not be made in the marketing of that part of our great farm production that is sold in this country and that which is sold abroad.

FREIGHT SCHEDULES

Another discrimination is the practice of allowing reduced railway rates on certain manufactured articles when shipped abroad. For instance, when manufactured iron and steel articles are sent from Pittsburgh to New York for domestic use, the rate is 36 cents per hundred pounds. When intended for shipment abroad, the rate between the same points on these articles is 20½ cents per hundred.

On farm implements shipped from Chicago to New Orleans for domestic use, the rate is 85 cents per hundred; when intended for export to Europe, the rate to New Orleans is reduced to 41½ cents per hundred. These are but samples of many reductions.

Cotton is the greatest export commodity in America. It is responsible for one-half of our balance of trade. If it is right to encourage the exportation of iron and steel by reducing railway rates on exportation, why would it not also be right to make these reductions apply to cotton and wheat?

THE CURRENCY QUESTION

In the next place, the value of the American dollar does not truly measure the value of commodities. If this is translated into farm commodities, the dollar is worth twice what it was a few years ago. It is manifestly impossible to pay debts that were created a few years ago with dollars of the increased value of to-day. Yet such a condition is prevalent not only in agriculture, but in other sections of our economic system as well.

The debts we owe, we owe to each other. We owe practically no debts abroad, but our whole situation is choked with debts owed among Americans and among American institutions. The difficulty of paying these debts with high-priced dollars received for low-priced farm products is responsible for a great deal of the present business stagnation.

This is perhaps the most important of all our problems, in connection with agriculture as well as with industry. Numerous suggestions have been made, including the reducing of the gold content of the dollar, the remonetizing of silver, and other methods of refiation.

Without undertaking to pass upon a method by which the result should be achieved, there is no doubt in my mind that some sound control method should be devised for making our unit of value more truly representative of real values. By thus restoring our money to its proper place in the picture, we will automatically increase the price of all commodities measured in terms of dollars.

There is now an almost universal recognition of the desirability of such a step. Again, many people differ as to the method to be used, but there does not seem to be any way out without doing so, unless we are to have wholesale liquidation and bankruptcy, which is unthinkable. Such a step would not be inflation. It would be refiation—a restoration of the value of money to its proper basis and undertaking to maintain it for what it was intended to be—a medium of exchange. It is now so out of proportion that instead of being a medium it is frequently a hindrance to exchange.

THE MORTGAGE QUESTION

Because of this unbalanced money system, it has been extremely difficult for farm owners to meet the payments of principal and interest out of the proceeds of farm products at prevailing prices. Most of these mortgages were established when the prices of farm products were much higher and when the value of the dollar was correspondingly low. A refinancing is necessary. There is not only the question of the willingness of the mortgagee to extend the time of the payment, but also the question of the bondholder who has furnished much of the money with which the mortgage companies have made these loans.

There should be a reamortization of these farm mortgages on the basis of long-time payments with a low rate of interest. Such a program must be instituted before there can be complete recovery.

TAXATION

People throughout the country are familiar with the fact that our taxes, especially of a State and local nature, bear too heavily on the farm and ranch. In fact, in many sections in recent years the returns from the farm have not been sufficient to pay the actual tax levy on the property itself. A shifting of these burdens, as well as a very real reduction in governmental expenses, national, State and local, is very much to be desired.

Unwise relief measures have aggravated the situation that exists to-day. Artificial measures should be of a temporary nature only, and even then must be carefully worked out and analyzed. In many instances enthusiasts with the best of heart motives and purposes have felt that artificialities would take the place of fundamental necessities and in instituting them have at times upset economic laws which, without producing the results desired, have interfered with orderly processes which would have worked themselves out.

INDEPENDENCE

This situation can not be healed by a system of credit. It is far more fundamental than that. Proper credit is necessary, but this does not pay debts; it tends to increase them. Better price levels are necessary in order that debts may be paid.

I want to repeat what I have said before and which is paraphrased from the statement of one of the greatest newspaper men

and most eloquent orators that America has produced. It should be repeated until its truths are burned into the very life of our people.

"When every farmer in America shall eat bread from his own fields and meat from his own pastures and, disturbed by no creditor and enslaved by no debt, shall sit amid his orchards and vineyards and barnyards and gardens, planting his crops in their seasons, and growing them in independence, making wheat and cotton his clean surplus, and selling them in his own chosen markets, in his own time and manner, and not at a master's bidding, taking his pay in cash and not in a receipted mortgage, which, while it ends a portion of his debt, does not restore his freedom, then will be dawning the fullness of a new day."

CONCLUSION

When agriculture prospers, the country prospers. When agriculture languishes, our skyscrapers become vacant, the factories close, and smokestacks rust in idleness. This is as universal as the law of life. Restore farm price levels and the busy spindle will sing by many an American stream.

The now well-nigh universal recognition of this fact is a manifestation of the faith that the masses which make America great have in the farm as the foundation of prosperity. When all else falls they return to the soil.

We must preserve that belief and maintain the faith which the people have in agriculture. And in so doing we must strike at the root of the trouble and weed out the discriminations and policies of favoritism.

At present we are faced with a dire emergency, and coping with such a situation may require drastic action. We must not sit idle while there is still a chance to bolster up agriculture until permanent principles can be restored.

The saying that "the souls of emperors and cobblers are cast in the same mold" is nowhere more true than in America, where the people must turn to the time-honored occupation of tilling the soil for their hope of recovery.

We have seen the shadow of a better day. It is our duty to make that shadow a reality—to build a strong, enduring structure of national integrity which will stand as a monument to the ideals upon which this Government was founded.

America has had a glorious past. We must look to her future.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the calendar.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WARREN. Is the Chair in position at this time to state to the House what suspensions are going to be considered and at what hour they will be taken up?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be pleased to give the House information on that subject; in fact, the Chair thinks it is the better policy to inform the House, so that it may know what is likely to come up.

There are four propositions that seem to the Chair worthy of consideration and matters that might properly be taken up under suspension of the rules.

The first is what is known as the Jones production loan bill, which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and for which there is a rule pending. If the bill could pass under suspension of the rules, it would obviate taking up probably a day in the consideration of the measure at some other time.

Then there is what is known as the Wilson bill, providing that contractors constructing Government projects shall use American products.

Then there is what is known as the grazing bill, a Western proposition, on which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS], and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] have brought a unanimous report from the committee.

Then there is a bill by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GOSS], which provides that where a contractor has a contract and has based his bid upon the bid of a subcontractor, if he does not use the subcontractor and gets the work performed at a cheaper price, the benefit accrues to the Government, as the Chair understands the proposition.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, is there a rule pending for the consideration of that bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, regarding that bill, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Through a misapprehension, I was one of those who objected to the consideration of that bill, thinking it occupied a different status. Upon closer study I have

found the criticism to be without merit. Could not that measure be taken up by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. Yes; it goes without saying that the bill could be passed at once in that way.

If the Chair may continue, there are two other propositions on which the Chair thinks he should recognize gentlemen to submit a unanimous-consent request in case the measures are not reached in the consideration of the calendar. One is a measure introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILLIAMS], and in order that the Members may be informed and have a chance to look the matter up, the Chair will state that it is a proposition reported unanimously from the Committee on the Territories permitting Alaska to issue \$100,000 worth of bonds to rebuild a schoolhouse that recently burned down. The other is a measure of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] involving a proposition to permit a per capita payment of \$25 to a group of Indians.

The Chair may recognize these gentlemen to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of their bills.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the last bill referred to is on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that, and if we do not reach these bills in the consideration of the calendar, we may take them up out of order, because of their public importance.

Mr. STAFFORD. The prior bill referred to is not on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Where a bill involves a matter of large public interest, the Chair thinks he is justified in recognizing a Member to ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. DYER. Will the Speaker permit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Can the Speaker tell us when we will have an opportunity to take up the Private Calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Chair at the last session tried to clear up the Private Calendar and the Consent Calendar. He thinks it indefensible for Congress to adjourn and have bills on the Private Calendar or the Consent Calendar without an opportunity for a hearing. The Chair will refer the gentleman from Missouri to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], who have charge of that matter.

Mr. DYER. Can the Speaker inform us at what time the suspension of the rules will be taken up?

The SPEAKER. From 1.30 to 2 o'clock. The Clerk will call the Consent Calendar.

CONSERVATION OF WILD LIFE, FISH, AND GAME

The first bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 263) to promote the conservation of wild life, fish, and game, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I stated when this was before the House a week ago that if the third section is stricken out, I would favor it. I believe that that is liable to misconstruction.

Mr. JONES. I have talked the matter over with those interested and we will let that section go out.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

THE NATURALIZATION LAWS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10274) to amend the act approved March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes."

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, the chairman of the committee [Mr. DICKSTEIN] had a consultation with me, and we had an understanding that this should be passed over again without prejudice, and I make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMEND THE ACT DETERMINING THE HEIRS OF DECEASED INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6684) to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposal and sale of allotment of deceased Indians, for the lease of allotments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, there have been several conferences about this bill, and there seems to be some conflict of opinion in regard to the bill. I have had a conference with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], in whose interest in the Indians I have the utmost confidence. I think certain amendments should be offered to protect the interests of the Indians. Here is one I would suggest: Page 5, line 1, after the "Provided further," I would insert "That any modification of said contracts shall stipulate."

Mr. HASTINGS. I have been giving considerable consideration to the bill, and I have a letter from the Indian Bureau which I received a few days ago indorsing it. With the permission of the House, I want to insert it here. It is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, January 5, 1933.

MY DEAR MR. HASTINGS: The office has your letter of December 30 requesting suggestions regarding H. R. 6684, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify existing contracts for the sale of timber from Indian lands.

Large sales of timber from Indian lands are made only after advertisement. Many of these contracts provide for the cutting of timber over a period of several years. Such contracts provide either for fixed or for discretionary increases in price at the end of a fixed number of years, usually four or five years after the execution of the contract, and at subsequent 3-year periods. The contracts toward the modification of which H. R. 6684 is particularly directed are those providing for fixed increases. The "basic prices" to which reference is made in lines 21 and 22 of page 4 of the bill are the prices bid for the first period of such contracts. These "basic prices" on existing contracts were all established when the lumber industry was in a fairly prosperous condition, and probably all represent the fair market value of the timber at the time of sale. Most of these "basic prices" are substantially above the prices that could be realized if the timber were being offered at the present time. Some of these "basic prices" are greatly above the prices at which timber of equal quality and accessibility can now be purchased. However, as pointed out in the last paragraph of office memorandum of January 25, 1932, transmitted with departmental report of March 3, 1932, on H. R. 6684, legislation that would authorize a reduction in price below the price bid for the first period of a contract would be open to the objection that it gave a successful bidder undue advantage over a lower bidder. This objection could not be urged with the same force against legislation that merely authorized the elimination of all increases over the original prices, which were intended to represent future increases in price which have not been realized.

For instance, the contract for the sale of the Long Prairie unit¹ on the Klamath Reservation was made in 1924 at \$6.67 per thousand feet board measure. On April 1, 1928, the price became \$7.47; on April 1, 1931, the price became \$8.37. The North Marsh unit was sold in 1924 at \$5.53. On April 1, 1928, the price became \$6.19, and on April 1, 1931, the price became \$6.93. The Weeks unit was sold in 1926 at a basic price of \$7.84. On April 1, 1930, the price became \$8.78, and on April 1, 1933, the price will become \$9.83. None of these units are being operated, nor is it believed possible for the purchasers to operate these units under present conditions without suffering heavy losses.

On the other hand, the Klamath Indians are being deprived of funds that could be realized if the prices were reduced sufficiently to permit the purchasers to operate, and on some of the units substantial losses through the depredations of forest insects are being suffered. It is believed that far more would be realized by the Indians through a revision of the existing contract prices than could be obtained if these contracts are forfeited or canceled.

Section 3, to which you refer, was not in the bill when reported on by the Interior Department; and it is believed that the inclusion of this section is unnecessary and, as you suggest, may result in serious difficulties. Each of the contracts that would be affected by the proposed legislation is subject to the requirements of the general timber sale regulations approved by the Department of the Interior on April 10, 1920, copy of which is attached. Section 47 of these regulations, which form a part of each timber contract, provides:

"Sec. 47. Indian labor will be employed by the purchaser at the same wages as other labor and in preference to other labor not already in his employ whenever the Indian labor seeks employment and is competent."

¹ These increases are 12 per cent for each period.—J. H. S.

It is believed that this regulation sufficiently protects the Indians in the matter of employment and that specific legislative provisions such as those in section 3 may operate to the disadvantage of the Klamath and other tribes of Indians.

Sincerely yours,

J. HENRY SCATTERGOOD,
Assistant Commissioner.

HON. W. W. HASTINGS,
House of Representatives.

There is no objection to the proposed amendment by the gentleman from New York. I was about to ask whether additional amendments are to be insisted upon by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

Mr. LEAVITT. I do not intend to insist on any to the point of delaying the bill. The representative of the Indians requested one amendment on page 5, line 3, where it says, "After consultation with the purchasers," and so forth, the words "and Indians" shall be inserted, so that it will read, "After consultation with the purchasers and the Indians." I would be glad to offer that amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have no objection to that amendment, but in conference with me the representatives of the Indians wanted me to agree that it should be necessary to have the consent of the Indians before any increase was made by the Secretary of the Interior, but I did not think that was necessary, because the increase was for the benefit of the Indians. I agree they should be consulted and have notice.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the gentleman's attention to this: I understand the Bureau of Indian Affairs is there for the purpose of protecting the Indians. In this instance there was a contract properly drawn, if you please, signed with the consent of the bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, there was more than one contract.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I am treating the matter collectively; and when the lumber company fell down on their contract, although there were bonds for the faithful execution of the contract, the Indian Bureau seems to have protected the lumber people instead of the Indians, because no action was taken. If this contract were between citizens, there could be no doubt that the owners of the timber would be in a position to sue on their contract.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that amendment. My entire purpose in introducing the bill is in the interest of the Indians.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is one thing that we ought to be assured of. I think this rather a bad way to legislate. This bill strikes out all of the Senate bill and inserts the House amendment, which, of course, throws the whole matter into conference. I want the assurance of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT], and with that I shall be satisfied, that the words "below the basic scale of prices" be retained in the bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. I give that assurance, of course.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I can assure the gentleman from Oklahoma it would have to come back to the House anyway.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want the gentleman's assurance that that language will stay in the bill in conference.

Mr. LEAVITT. I give that assurance, of course.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. With reference to the amendments suggested by the gentleman, after conference with the purchasers and the Indians, should not that term be a little more explicit?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; "the Indians involved."

Mr. LaGUARDIA. "And the Indians involved."

Mr. HASTINGS. I think that is all right.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is my intention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the bill as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and the preamble and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the Indians involved, expressed through a regularly called tribal council, and of the purchasers, may modify the terms of any now

existing and uncompleted contract of sale of Indian tribal timber, if in his judgment it is in the interests of the Indians to do so: *Provided*, That the prices are not reduced below the basic sale prices: *Provided further*, That any such modifications shall be upon the express condition that said purchaser shall forthwith proceed to operate under all the terms of said contract as modified or suffer forfeiture of such contract and collection upon his bond: *And provided further*, That in the event of sufficiently improved economic conditions the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the purchasers and after 90 days' notice to them, to increase stumpage prices of timber reduced in any such modified contract, but in no event to a point higher than was stipulated in the contract as it existed before such modification.

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may modify existing contracts between individual Indian allottees or their heirs and purchasers of their timber, under the terms and requirements of section 1 of this act, with the consent of the allottee or his heirs.

"Sec. 3. In all such modified contracts the purchasers of Indian timber on tribal lands or on restricted or trust allotments in all operations pertaining to the logging and manufacturing of said timber shall be required to give preference to the employment of Indian labor, and should a sufficient number of Indians apply for work they shall be employed to the extent of not less than three Indians to every non-Indian engaged. Local Indians, when applying for employment, shall be given preference over outside Indians. Wages paid to Indians shall be at the same rate as that paid to other employees and in no case less than the wages paid for corresponding labor in the territory where the operation is being carried on."

At the conclusion of the reading of the first paragraph—
Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: Page 1, line 5, after the word "further," insert "that any modification of said contracts shall stipulate."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 5, line 4, after the word "purchasers," insert "and the Indians involved."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the terms of existing contracts for the sale of timber on Indian lands when it is in the interest of the Indians to do so."

RESTORATION OF STATUS OF WARRANT OFFICERS, REGULAR ARMY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11174) to restore to their former retired status in the Regular Army of the United States persons who resigned such status to accept the benefits of the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735), and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask the gentleman from Texas a question. I understand that this bill involves only 11 warrant officers and 12 enlisted men.

Mr. KLEBERG. Ten enlisted men.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman assure us that that is the fact?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the Tyson bill was passed, we were assured the first time by the Veterans' Administration that it involved only 900 officers. Now, they have already granted pensions to 7,000.

Mr. KLEBERG. I assure the gentleman that there are just 21 men involved in this.

Mr. BLANTON. And it will not add over that number?

Mr. KLEBERG. No.

Mr. BLANTON. With that assurance I have no objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I have an amendment here which is necessary, suggested by the General Accounting Office, making it clear that none of these men shall receive double compensation.

Mr. KLEBERG. I have no objection to that and I accept such an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's amendment will not increase the number involved?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What will be the extra financial compensation to these men; more than what they would get otherwise?

Mr. KLEBERG. The only difference is that the money involved will come from a different source. At present the money comes from the Veterans' Administration; and if their original retired status in the Regular Army is restored, it will come from the Army. There is not one additional cent of Government expenditure. It is just a change in the status of these men, in accordance with a ruling of the Comptroller General, which has since been rescinded, that, in order that they might take advantage of the emergency officers act, they should retire from their original Army status.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, with that clear statement I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is a similar Senate bill, S. 4597, which I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it exactly the same?

Mr. KLEBERG. Identical.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the Senate bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to restore to his former status as a retired warrant officer or a retired enlisted man of the Regular Army of the United States with all pay, privileges, and emoluments pertaining thereto, any former emergency officer now on the emergency officers' retired list created by the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735), who resigned his retired status in the Regular Army in order to obtain the benefits of that act: *Provided*, That such former emergency officer shall make application in writing to the Secretary of War not later than June 30, 1933, for such restoration: *Provided further*, That restorations to the retired list of the Army under this act shall be effective as of July 1, 1933, and that no pay, privileges, or emoluments pertaining to the retired grade of the Regular Army to which such persons are restored shall accrue prior to the effective date of such restoration: *And provided further*, That after such restoration all persons so restored shall continue to be entitled, under the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735), to those rights and privileges only to which they would have been entitled if they had not resigned from the retired lists of the Regular Army.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 2, line 15, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

"Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to entitle any former emergency officer retired under the act of May 24, 1928, to retired pay from the Veterans' Administration in a greater amount than when added to the retired or retainer pay received from the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, shall equal 75 per cent of the pay the former emergency officer was entitled to receive, except pay under the act of May 18, 1920, when discharged from his commissioned service as a World War emergency officer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION CHARGES ON INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3675) relating to the deferment and adjustment of construction charges for the years 1931 and 1932 on Indian irrigation projects.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, last session on the call of the Consent Calendar I stated to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] that I wished to

give further consideration to this bill. I have done so, and I wish to know whether the gentleman has any objection to the following amendments, which in a way are minor, and, as I construe them, carry out the full intentment of the bill: After the word "payment," in line 5, insert "such of the," and after the word "charges," in the same line, insert "as are in default"; then, in line 9, strike out the words "to the same extent" and insert in lieu thereof the words "under the same terms."

Mr. LEAVITT. I can not object to that, of course.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under those circumstances I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, is this a new departure, or is this recognizing the same principle?

Mr. LEAVITT. No. Identical legislation was passed with reference to the irrigation projects on reclamation projects, and it was not extended to include these projects on Indian reservations. The people there are under exactly the same situation of low prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to defer the payment of construction charges for the calendar year 1931 on irrigation projects under the direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to adjust the construction charges for the calendar year 1932 on such projects in the same manner and to the same extent as provided by any act of Congress for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law approved April 1, 1932 (Public, No. 70, 72d Cong.).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "any" and insert the word "the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: On page 1, line 5, after the word "cf," insert "such of the," after the word "charges," in the same line, insert "as are in default"; and in line 9, after the word "and," strike out the words "to the same extent" and insert in lieu thereof "under the same terms."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE EX-PRESIDENT CALVIN COOLIDGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following appointment:

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, the Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the House to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to make all arrangements and publish a suitable program for the joint session of Congress to commemorate the life, character, and public service of the late Calvin Coolidge, former President of the United States: WOODRUM, of Virginia; DISNEY, of Oklahoma; ROGERS of New Hampshire; Mrs. ESlick, of Tennessee; MAPES, of Michigan; BEEDY, of Maine; and CARTER, of California.

ACQUISITION OF A CERTAIN BUILDING, FURNITURE, ETC., CRATER LAKE NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4070) to authorize the acquisition of a certain building, furniture, and equipment in the Crater Lake National Park.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; I will reserve it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have the view of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] as to the objection for paying for a permanent building in a park, which the Government is utilizing for its own purposes.

From the statement in the report, the building was of a value of something like \$6,000, as I recall, and they are offering to take \$1,000 in payment thereof.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. When any construction is put on Government property, it is always put there with the distinct understanding that if it is abandoned or if it ceases to serve its purpose it reverts to the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. And when this studio was put there, it was so understood.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Exactly.

Mr. BLANTON. And they got the benefit of its cost through its use.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was in the concession business before I went to college; in fact, I provided some of the means for paying my way through high school and college from this character of employment. I can conceive a comparable instance where under a lease proposal a building would be erected on leased ground, just as is done in the national parks. The lease terminates, the building is moved—

Mr. LaGUARDIA. They can not take it off.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no such principle involved. The lease may be renewed and the lessee continue using it. We are appropriating property here without any compensation.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. When any permanent structure is put on land belonging to the Government it is well known that when the lease ceases the structure can not be removed. That is fundamental. In this case it was done. The law distinctly provides—

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not question that when it is permanently affixed to the land, but this may be a building constructed on piers which could be removed without injury to the land. It then would not be a fixture, and yet you are proposing to deny the lessee any return for the property appropriated by the Government for its use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. LaGUARDIA, and Mr. HOLMES objected.

RESEARCH LABORATORY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 352) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to request allocation of funds; also to establish a research laboratory for utilizing cotton, cotton hulls, seed, linters, and waste farm products.

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. LaGUARDIA objected.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10673) to provide that advances under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act may be made to producers of livestock and to dairy farmers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my impression that at the last call of the Consent Calendar that this bill had passed or a similar bill had passed the Congress in the closing days of the session and the bill was passed over without prejudice, rather than making it lie on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, so I may confer with the author of the bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope particular attention will be paid to this announcement. People all over the Nation are wiring and writing letters to Members of Congress asking what action will be taken this session on the bill to pay the adjusted-service certificates.

A group of those interested in the payment of the certificates have requested me to announce that we will have a conference this afternoon at 4.30 in the caucus room in the House Office Building for the purpose of determining whether we will ask for consideration of the legislation at this session, whether we will postpone it to a special session of Congress, and also whether we shall ask for the payment of the certificates to the needy veterans, which would cost about \$1,000,000,000, the remainder of the idle gold to be used to issue sufficient currency to balance the Budget. I hope all Members interested in legislation along this line will be present, whether Democrat or Republican.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

FINAL ENROLLMENT OF KLAMATH INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2671) providing for the final enrollment of the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation in the State of Oregon.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection a minute?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I hope no Member of Congress will object to this bill. It provides for making a final roll of the Klamath Tribe of Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation in the State of Oregon. We are making final rolls of all Indian tribes.

I have examined this bill very carefully and it provides for making the final roll as of the date January 1, 1932. Of course, an amendment should be added changing this date to the date of the approval of the act.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Indians throughout the United States are having more trouble over making their rolls than any other one thing, and it is important now that the rolls of all these tribes, including the Klamath Tribe, be fixed and determined. I sincerely hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will withhold his objection and permit this bill to be passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I was impressed with the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He does not think it is to the best interests of the Klamath Tribe of Indians to have the roll determined at this time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I emphatically disagree with the position taken by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I think it is important to every Indian tribe in this country to have its rolls fixed and determined, so as not to spend all of its time and substance fighting against people from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf attempting to get on their rolls.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. How much will this cost, and who will pay for it?

Mr. LEAVITT. It comes out of the tribal funds.

Mr. JENKINS. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. LEAVITT. The Indians pay for it themselves.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit this to go over without prejudice that I may call up the Bureau of Indian Affairs and ascertain their viewpoint?

Mr. HASTINGS. The Indian Bureau does not agree to it; but I can not see any objection at all to having a roll made as of a certain date before all allotments are completed. Before the affairs of this tribe or of any other tribe are wound up you must have a roll made, and it takes some time to make such a roll. In the meantime, the Indians are in the course of having their lands allotted and most of the funds have been allotted.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I read this paragraph which rather swayed me in my opinion on this bill?

For these reasons we favor the so-called open or recurrent rolls, revised from time to time, when payments are to be made, to include only members of the tribe then living. In other words, it is better to deal with living members than dead "estates."

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, every one of these bills has been fully discussed.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; this bill was passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LEAVITT. The bill was passed over without prejudice and was not discussed at that time.

Mr. PARKS. While bills that have never been discussed have to be shoved out of the way for other bills that have been discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Woodrum). Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

OBLIGATIONS TO CERTAIN ENROLLED INDIANS

The Clerk called the next business on the Consent Calendar, House Joint Resolution 409, to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians under tribal agreements.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I have given further consideration to this bill and only this morning called up the Treasury Department in regard to it. I am having some investigation made as to the policy of the Treasury Department in the payment of interest on these refunds and I ask unanimous consent to have the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit just a word in explanation, refunds have been made of the principal amounts to these Indians and all that this resolution does is to permit interest to be paid on the amounts refunded exactly the same as if they were white people.

Mr. STAFFORD. In talking with the representative of the Treasury Department only this morning, he stated he could not understand why interest was not allowed, because that is the general policy. I want to get further detailed information from the department as to its attitude and its practice in these cases.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit, in a great many cases there are agreements or treaties providing that in the allotment of the lands of Indians, there are restrictions against taxation. They were erroneously interpreted by the Federal Government and in a great many cases the officers themselves paid the income taxes erroneously out of the money which it held for the Indians. This continued for a number of years and the statute of limitations finally ran against filing any claim for a refund. The Indians could not file claims for refunds because of the statute of limitations. Congress passed a resolution waiving the statute of limitations and authorizing them to file applications for refund of the principal but not for that of interest. The Government did refund certain amounts and all this resolution does is to permit refunds of interest on the amounts erroneously paid just the same as if they were white persons.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GUNNISON NATIONAL FOREST, COLO.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 12126, to add certain lands to the Gunnison National Forest, Colo.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill covers lands in three counties. The boards of county commissioners of two counties have asked that their lands be excluded; and if the author of the bill will permit an amendment excluding these lands, I shall withdraw any objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, while I think it would be beneficial to the stockmen of those counties to have all the land mentioned in this bill put in the forest reserve, nevertheless I will, of course, yield to the wishes of those

county commissioners and accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was influenced to allow this bill to go through, although it would be a departure from the policy of the last session when we objected to many similar bills, because 85 or 90 per cent of the land is Government land. If 85 or 90 per cent of the land is Government land, why should they not be included in the forest reserve notwithstanding the protest of some board of commissioners of some county?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit me to make a statement, this bill is very important to the development and stability of the stock interests of our State. We have in Colorado some 10,000,000 acres of public domain outside of the forest reserve. There is no official supervision over it. There is every year strife among the stockmen over the use of this public domain, especially between the sheepmen and cattlemen. These conflicts are a serious injury not only to the stockmen but to the ranchmen and everybody. Then there are many instances of overgrazing the land. It is necessary to have some system about it. When the lands are put in the forest reserves, the officials allot the lands and apportion them among the stockmen. We have tried for years to get the Interior Department and the Department of Agriculture to agree upon some system of regulation of the use of the public domain. But thus far we have not succeeded very well.

On this bill we have the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office, as well as the local officials, stockmen, ranchmen, business men, and I thought everybody out there was in favor of the addition of this land to the Gunnison National Forest to systematize the grazing on those lands. However, if Hinsdale and Saguache Counties do not desire to be included, I am perfectly willing to leave them out, especially as the latter one of those counties is in the congressional district of my colleague [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. STAFFORD. May it not affect the integral character of the entire tract?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; not at all. I sent the bill to the Secretary of Agriculture for his report, and he says it can be administered without an extra expense.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the last time we called the calendar there were several bills that did not involve as much land and they were objected to?

Mr. STAFFORD. This bill contains 85 to 90 per cent of public lands, and those other bills that were objected to did not contain more than 40 or 50 per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I was ill when this bill came up at the last call of the calendar and was not present in the House, so the bill was passed over without prejudice. I did not at that time understand that there was any objection to it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The land to be excluded under the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON] is still public land.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What is the advantage of having it excluded?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The only reason for excluding the lands in Hinsdale and Saguache Counties is because the boards of county commissioners of those counties have asked to have the bill not apply to them, and I am complying with their wishes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It would be to their advantage to have them in.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think so. The purpose of the bill is to make it possible to regulate the use of that land and protect local stockmen and ranchmen from being eaten out by outside migratory and often nonresident herds of sheep or cattle and prevent overgrazing. But if they do not want to come in, I do not want them to.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The county commissioners say they do not want this to occur at the present time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is timberland.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Partly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of protecting, improving, and utilizing their forest, watershed, and other resources, all lands of the United States, within the following-described areas are hereby, subject to existing valid claims, added to and made a part of the Gunnison National Forest, and the provisions of the forest exchange act of March 20, 1922, are hereby extended to said lands:

Township 44 north, range 1 west, sections 4, 5, 6; township 45 north, range 1 west, sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, 32; township 46 north, range 1 west, sections 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35; township 47 north, range 1 west, sections 1, 12 to 17, inclusive, 20 to 29, inclusive, 32 to 36, inclusive; township 51 north, range 1 west, sections 9 to 16, inclusive, 23, 24, 25, 26, 36; township 44 north, range 2 west, sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16; township 45 north, range 2 west, south half; township 45 north, range 3 west, sections 21 to 28, inclusive, 32 to 36, inclusive; township 45 north, range 1 east, sections 1, 2, 11; township 46 north, range 1 east, sections 13, 24, 25, 26; township 47 north, range 1 east, sections 2 to 6, inclusive; township 48 north, range 1 east, sections 32 to 35, inclusive; township 51 north, range 1 east, sections 7 to 36, inclusive; township 45 north, range 2 east, sections 1, 5, 8, 12, 13, 17, 20, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29; township 46 north, range 2 east, sections 1 to 7, inclusive, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27 to 35, inclusive; township 47 north, range 2 east, sections 7 to 12, inclusive, 15 to 22, inclusive, 27 to 36, inclusive; township 50 north, range 2 east, unsurveyed sections 1 to 16, inclusive, 22, 23, 24; township 51 north, range 2 east, unsurveyed sections 7, 8, 9, 16 to 21 inclusive, 28 to 33, inclusive; township 45 north, range 3 east, sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 18; township 47 north, range 3 east, sections 5, 7, 8; township 48 north, range 3 east, sections 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33; township 49 north, range 3 east, unsurveyed sections 1, 2, 11, 12; township 50 north, range 3 east, unsurveyed sections 1 to 27, inclusive, 34, 35, 36; township 48 north, range 4 east, sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 25 to 30, inclusive; township 49 north, range 4 east, unsurveyed sections 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36; township 48 north, range 4½ east, sections 1, 12, 13, all New Mexico principal meridian.

Township 15 south, range 64 west, west half section 7, southwest quarter section 15, sections 16 to 21, inclusive, west half section 22, south half and northwest quarter section 27, sections 29 to 34, inclusive; township 14 south, range 85 west, north half section 4, sections 5, 6, west half section 19, sections 30, 31; township 15 south, range 85 west, sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16 to 21, inclusive, 28 to 33, inclusive; township 13 south, range 86 west, sections 22, 26, 27, east half section 28, east half section 33, sections 34, 35; township 14 south, range 86 west, south half and northwest quarter section 13, sections 14, 15, sections 24, 25, 36; township 15 south, range 86 west, sections 1, 2, 3, east half section 4, east half section 9, sections 10 to 14, inclusive, north half section 23, sections 24, 25, 34, 35, 36, all sixth principal meridian, consisting of a total of approximately 260,000 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out everything after the figure "5," in line 11, through the figure "36," in line 5, page 2, and substitute the following:

"East half and east half of west half of sections 5 and 8, sections 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter and south half section 17, sections 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, 32; township 46 north, range 1 west, sections 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, east half and east half of west half of sections 5, 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32; township 47 north, range 1 west, sections 1, 12, to 16, inclusive, east half and east half of west half of sections 17, 20, 29, and 32, sections 21 to 28, inclusive, section 33 to 36."

Also in line 22, page 3, strike out the following: "east half section 4, east half section 9," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "lots 1, 7, and 8, section 4; lots 1 and 4, section 9."

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EATON of Colorado: Amend by striking out lines 10 and 11 on page 1, all of page 2, and lines 1 to 9, inclusive, on page 3, and in lieu of the description therein set forth insert: "Township 51 north, range 1 west, sections 9 to 16, inclusive, 23, 24, 25, 26, 36; township 51 north, range 1 east, sections 7 to 36, inclusive; township 50 north, range 2 east, unsurveyed sections 1 to 16, inclusive, 22, 23, 24; township 51 north, range 2 east, unsurveyed sections 7, 8, 9, 16 to 21, inclusive, 28 to 33, inclusive; township 49, range 3 east, unsurveyed sections 1, 2, 11, 12; township 50 north, range 3 east, unsurveyed sections 1 to 27, inclusive, 34, 35, 36; township 48 north, range 4 east, sections 1, 2, 11, and 12; township 49 north, range 4 east, unsurveyed sections 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36; township 48 north, range 4½ east, sections 1, 12, 13, all New Mexico principal meridian."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON] has proposed an amendment striking out the entire bill and substituting other lands by description.

None of us have had an opportunity to examine any of the descriptions, and I rise to inquire by what authority he can say that the lands included in the substitute are all situate in Gunnison County.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Instead of the whole bill being stricken and this amendment being put in lieu thereof, one paragraph of the bill is proposed to be stricken out, and that paragraph is rewritten including only the description of certain lands in Gunnison County, which are written as an amendment, thereby making one continuous list of lands, all in Gunnison County, covered by the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. What acreage will remain after the gentleman's amendment is incorporated?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I would say about half the acreage. By looking at the map and not by checking up the number of acres. I have personally checked with the map furnished by the representative of the Forest Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why are the commissioners of these two counties opposed to conservation of our public domain, when 85 to 90 per cent of the lands provided in this bill covering those counties are public lands and should be conserved? Are they opposed to conservation at all?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the purpose of the amendment if they are not?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If the gentleman were acquainted with the geography, he would recognize that the lands in Gunnison County are on one side of the Continental Divide, while the lands in the other counties are on the other side of the mountain tops.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not differentiate as to whether the lands should be conserved or not, so far as the forest is concerned. I think these commissioners are opposed to any conservation at all. Eighty-five to ninety per cent of the lands involved are in Government ownership, and yet these commissioners are opposed to having them given protection of the forest conservation. I would like to know whether the gentleman favors that policy by the exclusion of proper forest lands on the Government domain being included in the forest reserve. That is the purport of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I do not know of anybody here who favors the exclusion of proper lands from the forest reservation; but questions of administration arise, and these county commissioners are in continual touch with the members of the forest reserve.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are also in touch with private interests, and I think they are prompted by private interests in this instance.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman is entitled to his own thought.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is supported by the report of the department.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. These requests come to me as a member of the Committee on Public Lands from the boards of county commissioners, and they express the view of the people in each county. I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my remarks the protest of these two counties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LAKE CITY, COLO., July 1, 1932.

Hon. WM. R. EATON:

In the matter of H. R. 12126, we wish to protest strongly the addition of any lands in Hinsdale County, Colo., to the Gunnison or any other national forest. The opinions of our citizens almost unanimously condemn such action.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
W. O. BAKER, Chairman.

SAGUACHE, COLO., July 5, 1932.

Hon. WILLIAM R. EATON,

Representative from Colorado, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EATON: At a regular meeting of the Board of County Commissioners of Saguache County, Colo., held in Saguache on the 5th day of July, 1932, H. R. 12126, introduced May 17, 1932, by Congressman TAYLOR, was brought up for consideration before the board by landowners and stockmen in the area affected, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the entire membership of the board to wit:

"Be it resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Saguache County, Colo., That the board go on record as being opposed to the passage by Congress of H. R. 12126 in so far as it affects any of the domain and patented areas in Saguache County, for the reason that such an act would be opposed to the best interests of the ranchmen and stockmen of Saguache County; and that the clerk of the board send a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Congressmen from Colorado."

Respectfully,

JNO. T. SEYFRIED,
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners of
Saguache County, Colo.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it appears that there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States, H. R. 12126, by Congressman TAYLOR of Colorado, which provides for the addition of certain areas to the Gunnison National Forest, said areas comprising a total of approximately 260,000 acres; and it appearing that the Public Lands Committee has reported said bill favorably to the House; and

Whereas this board has read and considered said bill and has carefully examined a map showing the areas to be added to the Gunnison National Forest; and said board is acquainted with said areas and knows the character of the land contained therein and the location thereof, and is familiar with the forest conditions in this county; and

Whereas it appears that the areas sought to be added are chiefly valuable for forest purposes, taking the whole area together, is necessary for watershed protection, and the new boundary as drawn is a most practical and reasonable boundary for the protection of the Gunnison National Forest and its administration; and

Whereas it appears that over the areas sought to be added there has been extensive grazing to the extent that the watershed is no longer protected and erosion of the soil is becoming increasingly great; and it is necessary to preserve the grasses and the coverings of the soil to prevent erosion and to preserve and protect the timber that is found over such areas; and

Whereas the board knows the prevailing opinion among the people of this part of the country concerning the necessity of adding such areas to the national forest and knows that it is the prevailing opinion of those familiar with the situation that it is for the best interests of the national forest and the community at large, as well as for the protection of the leading industries of this community and the portion of the country adjacent to the Gunnison National Forest that said bill be passed and said addition to the Gunnison National Forest be approved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Gunnison County, Colo., in special meeting held this 10th day of June, A. D. 1932, That we approve H. R. 12126, being a bill to add certain lands to the Gunnison National Forest in Colorado, and that we urge our Senators and Congressmen to support said bill and to do everything in their power to secure its passage: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congressmen and Senators from Colorado.

On motion of Whalen, seconded by Little, the above and foregoing resolution was introduced, passed, and adopted by unanimous vote of the board, this 10th day of June, A. D. 1932.

FRANK COMSTOCK,
W. H. WHALEN,
R. A. LITTLE,

Board of County Commissioners of Gunnison County, Colo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF FOREST EXCHANGE ACT, OREGON

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 763) to extend the provisions of the forest exchange act to lands adjacent to the national forests in the State of Oregon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this bill is too broadly drawn. It provides that a previous act of Congress shall be made applicable to any land within 6 miles of the boundaries of the national forests in the State of Oregon. That is pretty broad language.

Mr. JENKINS. I think this language is about the same as was contained in some bills objected to at the last call of the calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT. The forest exchange act is the act that is meant to apply to this strip within the 6-mile limit, which

in order to consolidate areas and acquire timber-raising lands by the Federal Government would authorize an exchange. That can all be done now within the limits of the forests.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is this public land now?

Mr. LEAVITT. The exchange would be with private owners, of course. If it were all public land, there would be nobody to exchange with.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And it would be transferred to the Forest Service?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Within the 6-mile zone they might all be privately owned lands. This is a bill providing for the concentric increase of boundaries of the national forests, ad infinitum.

Mr. LEAVITT. It would not go beyond the present boundaries, or rather not beyond 6 miles of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SETTLEMENT OF WAR CLAIMS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2352) amending the act entitled "An act authorizing the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the civilization fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States," approved February 6, 1921 (41 Stat. 1097).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. And while I am on my feet, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Klamath timber bill which passed a few moments ago, by inserting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS UNDER WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1928

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 416, to extend the time for filing claims under the settlement of war claims act of 1928, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DETERMINATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF SEMINOLE INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5846) authorizing the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear and determine certain claims of the Seminole Nation or Tribe of Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Only two objections are heard. Three objections are required.

The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill S. 4340, a similar bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HASTINGS. Reserving the right to object, is it identical?

Mr. McKEOWN. It is practically identical except the latter part. It strikes out an amendment with reference to a certain tract, because that is in the Court of Claims.

Mr. HASTINGS. But it does not enlarge the amount that is involved?

Mr. McKEOWN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized in opposition to the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. May the bill be reported first, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the Senate bill for information.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Authorizing the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear and determine certain claims of the Seminole Nation or Tribe of Indians.

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statutes of limitation, to hear and determine any suits heretofore or hereafter instituted by the Seminole Nation or Tribe of Indians, or on their behalf, or by any committee selected by the Seminole Indian Protective Association to represent such Indians, with respect to the title to the following described lands in Seminole County, Okla., or any clouds thereon, to wit: The south half northeast quarter and the southeast quarter, section 7; the south fifteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths acres of lot 3, and lots 6 and 7, section 8, all in township 7 north, range 8 east, Indian meridian, containing 320 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. The District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma shall have full authority, by proper orders and process, to bring in and make a party to the proceedings any person deemed by it necessary or proper to the final determination of the matter in controversy. The judgment or decree of such court shall be subject to review in accordance with the law governing like cases.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, whether that limits jurisdiction to the particular tracts of land involved?

Mr. McKEOWN. That is right. It does not allow them to have any jurisdiction over claims in the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to substitution of the Senate bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, with the understanding that the amendment that is incorporated in the House bill is not to be offered to the Senate bill, I have no objection.

Mr. McKEOWN. No; it will not be offered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the substitution of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Senate bill will be considered as read.

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I recognize the futility of trying to defeat these bills, which seem to have so many friends in the House, but there are certain features of this bill which ought to be called particularly to the attention of the House.

In the first place, they had their day in court, and because of lapse of time, and more particularly, I assume, although I make no statement to that effect, because some claims lawyer here in Washington has dug up this claim after the expiration of the time, it comes here, and instead of being referred to the Committee on Claims it is referred to a district court out in Oklahoma, where human interest, as everywhere else, will undoubtedly be influenced. I mean, of course, no reflection upon the court as a whole.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. The gentleman, I think, has in mind an entirely different bill.

Mr. UNDERHILL. No. This bill is to authorize the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to settle this case.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am satisfied the gentleman from Massachusetts is confusing this bill with another bill on the calendar. This case has not been tried in the Court of Claims.

Mr. McKEOWN. If the gentleman will allow me to explain.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman explain why it is asked to take it up after the limitation of time has expired?

Mr. McKEOWN. There is no limitation of time, except this: This is a case where the department approved a lease to an oil company for \$100 an acre when all the surrounding land was bringing \$1,000 an acre, and these Indians came and asked the department why it was the department approved a lease for \$100 an acre when the land was bringing \$1,000 an acre. The department said, "We are willing for you to go and try that in the court in the eastern district of Oklahoma," which is the only court that can try the rights of these Indians against the oil company, as to this lease. Their claim is that the lease is void because of very inadequate consideration.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Why not try it before the Court of Claims?

Mr. McKEOWN. Because the Court of Claims can not try an ejectment suit. This is to try the title to the right of that lease on that land, and no court has jurisdiction except the eastern district of Oklahoma. That is all that is involved in this case. They are simply asking the right to have their case heard, and the department saw the justice of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. In just a moment. I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that we have on this calendar, and have had on every Consent Calendar, claim after claim for the Indians. I have no particular objection to the Indians, although they are the only group in the whole United States that has not been affected by the depression. We feed them, clothe them, take care of them, and then we appropriate money out of the Treasury for them. We educate them and we gave them rights of citizenship, and then we have to come here and pass special legislation in their behalf. I think we are going too far with the poor Indian. The Indian ought to be well enough educated to take care of himself, to take care of his finances, and to take care of his living. He ought to take his cut the same as everybody else, and I am fundamentally opposed to such legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman not think it comes with poor grace for him or any other Member to object to allowing the Indians to go into the United States court and have their rights adjudicated and abide by the judgment of that court, and does the gentleman think he should object to legislation that will give them that privilege? While I am on my feet I want to express my gratification at the information given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] that the Indians of this country are not affected by the depression. Let me remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that at one time the Indians had possessory right to the entire United States from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf, and all of our records of dealings with the Indians reducing their landed possessions are not to be very greatly commended, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree to that.

Mr. UNDERHILL. But that is no reason why we should go back to the dim and distant past, and pass special legislation at every Congress for the benefit of various Indians.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is the gentleman afraid of our own courts?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF HOMESTEAD RIGHTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4029) to restore homestead rights in certain cases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection in order that the gentleman from Montana may make a statement?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I sincerely hope the gentleman will not object to this bill. It does not cost anybody anything.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; it costs the people of my State the privilege of going and settling on the public domain. When a citizen out in the gentleman's country has had that privilege before and sold his land obtained under the homestead rights, why should the people of the country be barred from the homestead privilege and a special favor conferred upon the denizens of the gentleman's State?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. If it is fixed in the gentleman's mind that he is going to object, I see no use consuming the time of the House further.

Mr. LEAVITT. I hope the gentleman is not fixed in that determination.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am most fixed in this determination and have been for many years. I object to the people of the country being barred from homestead rights, preferential treatment being given to favored citizens of the gentleman's State.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

OTOE AND MISSOURIA TRIBES OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10927) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the rights of the Otoe and Missouria Tribes of Indians to compensation on a basis of guardian and ward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. DYER objected.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve my objection to allow the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. GARBER. This bill has been called to the attention of the House several times and the objections heretofore made seemed to be based upon an adverse report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Now, if the gentleman will only examine that report—

Mr. STAFFORD. May I say right there that I have not only examined the report once but I have examined it three times, and only yesterday I went over it again thoroughly and could not bring myself around to supporting this bill. They have already had their day in court and the attorney for the Indians withdrew their claim.

Mr. GARBER. Right there is where the gentleman is mistaken; these Indians have never had their day in court.

If the gentleman will read the last paragraph of the adverse report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, he will change his mind. The bill as originally introduced did contain some of the objections set forth in the report, but as drafted by the subcommittee, it eliminated all of the objections of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with the exception of two, and that paragraph reads as follows:

The changes which have been made do not remove our fundamental objection to the bill which is based primarily on the fact that the plaintiff was still in court as to the third claim on the merits.

There were three causes of action set up in the petition and the court sustained the demurrer as to two of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to two of them; yes.

Mr. GARBER. The court overruled the demurrer as to the third. Now, the third cause of action simply set up a claim for small amounts due under several different treaties and the amount was considered of insufficient importance to carry on this litigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that three gentlemen having signified their intention of objecting to the bill, the Chair feels that the call of the calendar should proceed.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the objection raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin I desire to briefly explain the equity of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman desire to further reserve his objection and give the gentleman from Oklahoma further time?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my objection to give the gentleman time to explain the bill.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the substantial merits of one of the important claims of these Indians on which they have never had their day in court. One of these claims is for the balance due on the purchase price of certain lands. Their lands were appraised and were then sold at public sale.

The lands sold comprised 43,293.29 acres, but before being sold they were appraised at \$256,887.07. Pursuant to due notice given, they were sold at public sale to the highest bidders in the aggregate amount of \$516,851.52. (Computation of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, February 1, 1894.) On such date there had been paid \$322,075.70 principal and \$28,253.51 interest, making a total of \$350,329.21. There remained then due upon the basis of the price at which the lands were sold, \$194,775.82 principal and the interest thereon computed to February 1, 1894, \$100,432.91, making a total of \$295,208.73, or a total amount due in round numbers on March 12, 1900, of \$320,000.

Let it be remembered that in making these sales the Government was acting at all times as the agent for and guardian of the Indians, to be held strictly accountable for the collection of the purchase price and the correct accounting thereof to the Indians.

After the sale many of the settlers defaulted in the payments to be made for their land and for 19 years importuned Congress to enact laws releasing them from their obligation to pay the purchase price for said lands and to permit them to receive title to said lands upon the payment of the appraised value only.

The sale of the lands was authorized by an act of Congress, March 3, 1881 (21 Stat. L. 380), the public sale of the lands taking place in May, 1883, at the United States district land office at Beatrice, Nebr. By act of Congress, March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. L. 371), the time of final payment was extended for two years; by act of Congress, August 2, 1886 (24 Stat. L. 214), the time of final payment was further extended for the period of two years; by act of Congress, March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. L. 586), the Secretary of the Interior was authorized and directed to revise and adjust on principle of equity the sale of lands in the reservation, the consent of the Indians having been first obtained. The Secretary of the Interior was unable to secure the consent of the Indians for the sale of the lands at the appraised price or to secure their consent to any rebate from the purchase price. For 19 years the settlement was attempted to be effected with the Indians, during which time they were denied payment.

Finally, through the misrepresentations of James McLaughlin, an inspector, the Indians were induced to sign a paper which, in fact, was a consent to a rebate of the purchase price. This consent was given by 73 adults, 34 of whom signed by mark. Such number did not comprise all the adult or minor members of the tribes. They were induced to sign upon the representation that they would receive an Indian payment. Their consent was not given in open council but was procured by going around from tent to hut and inducing the members individually to sign such consent, believing it to be as represented, namely, a paper that would secure the payment to them of over \$70 each.

It was upon the basis of this paper, being the voluntary consent of the Indians, that Congress passed the act of April 14, 1900, providing for an adjustment of the price agreed to be paid for the lands. Said act was dependent upon the consent of the Indians having been first obtained, and such consent never having been in fact obtained, the authority to adjust a rebate from the purchase price and accept in lieu thereof the appraised price plus 25 per cent of the selling price with interest should not have been granted. It, how-

ever, was granted, and the settlers received the benefits of the rebate in the purchase price which should have been paid to the Indians.

Let it be remembered that such offer of settlement had been previously presented to the Indians in open council and each time rejected by them. The hearings contain a number of affidavits from the Indians whose marks appear attached to the purported consent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARBER. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The basis of the claim is upon a treaty and facts arising back in 1854, yet the gentleman is providing in his amendment for the consideration of claims growing out of improper, unjust, or inequitable methods. At this late date how is the Government going to protect itself against such an omnibus provision as that?

Mr. GARBER. The basis of the claim for the balance of the purchase price of the lands is not dependent upon any treaty, as stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The basis of the claim is for a balance of the actual purchase price of the lands sold at public sale which has never been paid to these Indians. There is nothing hazy or uncertain about this claim. The facts are of record, the appraised value, the purchase price, and the amount of the rebates.

Without an act of Congress, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, these Indians are without any remedy for the collection of the money due them. Not only are the "wards of the Nation" not permitted to sue the sovereign but neither are its citizens, except when the sovereign expressly waives immunity of sovereignty and by act of Congress provides a forum in which the claim of the citizen or "wards of the Nation" may be fully investigated and determined according to the principles of justice and equity which are the objectives of our political system.

In this case a companion bill has already been reported out by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. It has passed the Senate and is now on the Speaker's table—Senate bill 4578. The bill under consideration was unanimously reported out by the House Indian Affairs Committee. For one Member to take advantage of the rules and object to its favorable consideration on the Consent Calendar is an exercise of power which, to say the very least, requires full explanation, and such has not been given in this case. Such does not represent the agencies of the legislative department of government. Such arbitrary objection here made does not represent the Senate. It does not represent the unanimous approval of the House Indian Affairs Committee, composed of 21 members. It is not the purpose of this Nation to do injustice. Equal and exact justice is the objective of the Government, and this is equally true when its most helpless wards are involved.

The United States was the trustee of the lands sold for the Indians, and held the title in trust for them and agreed to sell them to the best advantage to the Indians. The Indians looked to the Government for protection. They relied in good faith upon its disposition to do what was best for them. They now ask the Government to permit them to present proof of the justness of their claims to an authorized agency of the Government. The Court of Claims has been given jurisdiction to hear such claims against the Government when the Government gives its consent. It can issue no execution to enforce the payment of any amount which it might find to be due. The Indians must then appeal to the sovereign for an appropriation to pay the claim ascertained by the court to be due, and, if the legislative department refused to appropriate, the Indians would be without redress.

These Indians were once powerful but, at all times, peaceful tribes. Their first treaty with the Government, in 1823, was for a cession of their lands west of the Missouri River, amounting to over 11,000,000 acres. By different treaties, from time to time, they have peacefully relinquished their possessory rights to their lands until to-day they have but 121,000 acres left and only \$157 in their tribal funds.

If they were permitted to sue and present their claims, and if they were then given judgment, the bill under con-

sideration provides that when collected the money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians, thereafter to be appropriated by Congress for their education, health, and for industrial purposes.

Those arbitrarily exercising the power of objection under the consent rule in thus defeating an act already passed by the Senate and unanimously reported out by the House Indian Affairs Committee must be in possession of inside information which the agencies of the House were never able to procure and must be motivated by strong considerations which, to say the least, impose the duty of satisfactory explanation, and that, as yet, has not been forthcoming.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the gentleman's attention the fact that in dealing with these Indians the United States Government has never in a single instance kept its word or its treaty with any of the Indian tribes?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I can not allow such a wholesale charge to go unchallenged in every instance.

Mr. McKEOWN. I make the charge that the Government has not kept its word with these Indian tribes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I can not allow such a charge to go unchallenged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. DYER objected.

UNITED STATES COTTON STANDARDS ACT

The Clerk called the next business on the Consent Calendar, House Joint Resolution 434, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide additional facilities for the classification of cotton under the United States cotton standards act and for the dissemination of market news information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under reservation of objection, I think it would expedite consideration of this bill if it were passed over without prejudice. I make this request for the reason that since the gentleman spoke to me on Saturday I have examined the original act and I am in difficulty to know what additional privileges the gentleman seeks to confer on the cotton farmers generally which are not conferred by the original act.

Mr. FULMER. I will be pleased to give the gentleman the information. That is the only reason for the passage of this measure—to extend to farmers additional benefits. Cotton classifiers and samplers will be placed under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the intent of the original act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the original act, as I read it, the Department of Agriculture has authority to appoint these agents.

Mr. FULMER. May I state that the Department of Agriculture now has the right to license these cotton graders for any cotton firm, but we propose to give supervision of classers to the department. We also put in this bill licensed samplers to operate where the sales of cotton by farmers are not large enough to employ a cotton grader.

May I state further that pending the passage of this legislation the Department of Agriculture in the fall of 1930 and 1931 sent into my State an expert cotton grader to operate as if the bill were operating, and if I had the time I could tell the gentleman the wonderful advantage in extending the benefits of the actual length of cotton and the actual grades to farmers. These benefits will not only give to farmers a better price for cotton but will tend to improve grade and staple length of cotton. This will also assist the South to compete with foreign cotton countries that are now improving their cotton as to length of staple. This bill does not carry an appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. It carries the implication that appropriations will be made for an additional army of agents. It is about that phase that I wish to confer with the gentleman privately and to call up the department.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman will bear in mind that that has already been thrashed out in the committee, and Mr. Kitchen, representing the department, stated that under

the original act all the expense would be borne by the farmers and the merchants who receive these benefits. This measure is indorsed by the department, as well as the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not the original act before me.

Mr. FULMER. I talked with the gentleman about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have examined the act since then and I want to consider it further.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 11816, to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Speaker announced that this is one of the bills on which he would recognize a motion to suspend the rules. I realize we will be helpless under suspension of the rules.

The title of the bill is very promising and alluring, but I do not believe the text of the bill carries out its very alluring title, and I am going to oppose it under suspension of the rules; and for that purpose I shall object.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will note that section 10 of this bill provides that an additional 35 per cent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which said grazing district is situated.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And that is not all of it.

Mr. BLANTON. That is enough to justify an objection to it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is the gentleman going to join the opposition to this bill under suspension?

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will permit, we have attempted to make this bill conform to what we pay now out of the forest-reserve fees, except 25 per cent is paid for the use of schools and roads and an additional 10 per cent spent locally on forest roads and trails.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think this bill ought to pass.

Mr. COLTON. We pay 25 per cent and then get an additional 10 per cent spent locally by the Forest Service.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall join the gentleman from New York in objecting to the bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Let me also call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that once a lessee of any importance enters into a lease, he practically has a stranglehold on the property, because a subsequent lessee would have to buy his fences and his equipment and would be absolutely at the mercy of the original lessee.

Mr. COLTON. It would be taken over at an appraised price and the permittee would have a voice in determining its value.

Mr. BLANTON. The bill ought not to pass by unanimous consent, and I shall join the gentleman from New York in objecting.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MINING OF COAL, PHOSPHATE, OIL, ETC., ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The Clerk called the next business on the Consent Calendar, S. 4509, to further amend the act approved February 25, 1920, entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice the bill does not follow the recommendations of the department in having the deferred rentals applied on any royalties that may arise in the future.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The recommendations of the department were discussed by the Committee on Public

Lands very carefully, and we finally differed from the judgment of the commissioner.

There are two sets of leases issued to these oil lands—"a" and "b." They cover two classes of public lands, naval oil reserves and those for the purposes of the Department of the Interior. On account of the depression the Government has requested certain lessees to refrain from production, but under the law the Government collects rental for the non-production period.

It seems unfair for the Government to order lessees to refrain from production and then collect rent for the non-production period.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Colorado does not grasp my objection. I am asking to have an amendment incorporated on page 2 that these collections shall be applied to royalties due for future production, so that when they come to the further operation of the oil leases these deferred rentals will be applied to the royalties.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. That makes little difference with the existing law; but for the purpose of getting the bill passed I am authorized by the chairman of the committee to say that we have no objection to the amendment at this time, thus sending the bill back to the Senate, and if it will not concur in your amendment, a conference committee can iron out the difference.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that understanding, I have no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437), entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding thereto the following section:

"Sec. 39. In the event the Secretary of the Interior, in the interest of conservation, shall direct or shall assent to the suspension of operations and productions of coal, oil, and/or gas under any lease granted under the terms of this act, any payment of acreage rental prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operations and production; and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding any such suspension period thereto: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting existing leases within the borders of the naval petroleum reserves and naval oil-shale reserves."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "production," insert the words "to be applied to royalties due for future production."

Mr. PATTERSON. What is the effect of the amendment; what is the purpose of it?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Department of the Interior recommends that the rentals during the interim when oil is not being produced should be applied to royalties under the general law, shall be applied to the deferred rentals. That is only fair to the Government. We are granting a deference of charges while they are not in operation, and when they do begin operations the deferred rentals should be applied to the royalties.

Mr. PATTERSON. These rentals are for the nonproduction period.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are deferring the charges for rent and royalties during this interim when they are not being operated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS DUE TO UNEMPLOYMENT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12097) for the relief of distress due to unemployment, to create a committee for Federal, State, and local cooperation in placing qualified unemployed persons on unoccupied farms for the purpose of growing subsistence food crops during the continuance of the unemployment emergency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

READJUSTMENT OF LEASE OF POST-OFFICE GARAGE IN BOSTON, MASS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 88) to authorize the Postmaster General to investigate the conditions of the lease of the post-office garage in Boston, Mass., and to readjust the terms thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

CLAIM OF MERCEDES MARTINEZ VIUDA DE SANCHEZ

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12742) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Government of the Dominican Republic for the account of Mercedes Martinez Viuda de Sanchez, a Dominican subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? This bill requires three objectors.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RAIMUNDA VALLADARES DE CALDERON

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12744) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Government of Nicaragua for the account of Raimunda Valladares de Calderon, a citizen of Nicaragua.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for payment to the Government of Nicaragua for the account of Raimunda Valladares de Calderon, the widow of Justo Calderon, and the children of Justo Calderon, a native of Nicaragua, who was shot to death by a member of the United States naval forces on January 30, 1930, the sum of \$2,500.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. When some of these incidents were reported to this country the veracity was questioned and great protest arose against newspaper men and others reporting the facts. Whenever any Members of the House and of the Senate referred to conditions in Nicaragua or quoted these reports we were howled down and the occupation of Nicaragua lauded to the skies as rendering a very useful service down in Central America. If there ever was a case of cold-blooded murder it was this case, calling for payment of indemnity by our Government as provided in the bill now under consideration. For no reason at all, after this native had been captured and was under arrest, on foot, going along with a mounted escort, one of the marines dismounted and shot the man down in cold blood in the presence of his son, a 13-year-old boy. I believe the marine was given two years' sentence for this cold-blooded murder after court-martial. He offered no defense except that he was intoxicated, which aggravates rather than mitigates the offense.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman happen to listen in the other afternoon to the radio speech of Gen. James G. Harbord, who, besides drawing a general's retired pay for life, draws \$75,000 a year from the radio corporation?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I heard the speech to which I think the gentleman refers.

Mr. BLANTON. On the subject of the marines. I take it that he would have the Government place our marines in every foreign country on the face of the globe.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. He stated that if we reduce the number of marines from 15,000 to 13,000 we would have to hang crêpe on the crosses of the boys in France. Personally I can not see the relevancy of such a statement. Of course, no one can agree with such a statement as that. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to point out the grave danger of sending our troops at the request of any bankers of my city or any special interest to foreign lands. We have a series of cases of this kind—this is only one—and we had a half dozen last Consent Calendar day of Nicaraguan citizens who claimed damages, and cases in China, for which the Government had to pay indemnity. These are going to pile up. I take this opportunity to sound a word of warning. There are grave conditions in the Far East at this time. I hope that we will have learned from the lesson of the World War that we should do everything possible to prevent loans and to prevent shipment of munitions, in order not to embroil ourselves in the conflict in that part of the world. If loans are made to one or the other of the combatants in the Far East, it may eventually bring our country, or at least furnish the motive to get us into war. After we start up a war trade, one of the losing parties will embroil this country, and we will be in another world war. We are still paying for the lesson we learned in 1917, and I hope that the greatest restraint will be exercised in this House as reports come from the Far East, so that we will not be dragged into another world war. American lives are worth more than bankers' loans. Our peace and tranquillity are worth more than profits on war supplies. Let us act accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SALVADOR BUITRAGO DIAZ

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12748) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Government of Nicaragua for the account of Salvador Buitrago Diaz, a citizen of Nicaragua.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will there be any objection to an amendment reducing this amount from \$1,500 to \$500? This is a relative proposition. No lives were lost. It involves the destruction of property.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the facts are set forth in this report, and on those facts your committee thought that the amount reported in the bill was a reasonable compensation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for payment to the Government of Nicaragua for the account of Salvador Buitrago Diaz, a Nicaraguan citizen, as full indemnity for damages alleged to have been done to his property by United States marines on February 6, 1921, the sum of \$1,500.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Further, with regard to the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], with which I agree, I think it is highly improper for a retired general of our Army, who has ceased to serve the United States, yet who is drawing for life the pay of a major general while he is drawing a tremendous salary from a private corporation, to make the kind of a speech over a national hook-up that was made by General Harbord last week. It is the Congress of the United States that represents the people, and not General Harbord.

I think also that it is highly improper for a man like William Randolph Hearst to print the kind of an editorial that he printed in his Washington Herald this morning, making a general attack upon every Member of Congress. What did Mr. Hearst ever do when he was a Member of

this body that is worth remembering? Can any Member think of anything?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield. Certainly, if my friend from New York knows anything worth remembering that Mr. William Randolph Hearst accomplished when he was a Member of this body, he should place it in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Not when he was in the Congress; but he gives us the largest funny sheet of any newspaper in Washington, does he not? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but to offset that we have poems by HAMILTON FISH and others. [Laughter.] Because he could not repeal the eighteenth amendment and put a sales-tax burden upon the shoulders of the people of America, Mr. Hearst is now mad, and he says Congress has not done a thing but fritter away the time and money of the people. What does he know about it? Mr. Hearst would have been perfectly pleased with this Congress if we had passed the repeal resolution and if we had brought the beer saloon back and if we had put the sales tax on the burdened shoulders of the people. He would have been perfectly satisfied; but because he does not like some speeches that are made over in the Senate just now, in order to hit a back-hand slap at some Senator, he attacks the whole Congress of the United States and makes some of the people over the United States, through his string of chain newspapers, believe that we have done nothing; that we are frittering away the time and money of the people.

I am glad that the American people are represented by the membership of this body and not Mr. Hearst. I think the interests of America are better safeguarded by the Representatives that we have here than by the representation they get through Mr. Hearst's string of chain newspapers. How long is he going to continue his unjust attacks on Congress?

He is jealous because the membership of this House has access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when they want to have articles reprinted and sent to their people.

Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a safeguard to Members, the big chain newspaper interests in this country could ruin and run out of public life every man who serves in this Congress. The expense of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a bagatelle in comparison to the great service that it renders the people of America. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for payment to the Government of Nicaragua for the account of Salvador Buitrago Diaz, a Nicaraguan citizen, as full indemnity for damages alleged to have been done to his property by United States marines on February 6, 1921, the sum of \$1,500.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ENRIQUETA KOCH V. DE JEANNERET

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12751) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Government of Chile for the account of Enriqueta Koch v. de Jeanneret, a citizen of Chile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for payment to the Government of Chile for the account of Enriqueta Koch v. de Jeanneret as complete indemnity for injuries to her daughter, Lucia de Jeanneret, of Valparaiso, Chile, occasioned by an assault at Valparaiso by Andrew Stanley Kondek, seaman, United States Navy, on February 4, 1921, and as reimbursement of all expenses caused thereby, the sum of \$2,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY BORDAY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12752) authorizing an appropriation for payment to

the French Government for the account of Henry Borday, a citizen of France.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought ever to permit another American dollar to enter France until that country sees fit to meet its financial obligations to the United States. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections are required.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NAMING OF SUBCONTRACTORS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9921) to require contractors on public-building projects to name their subcontractors, material men, and supply-men, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. TABER. I withhold it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the calendar to be brought up under suspension of the rules, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF SIX MONTHS' GRATUITY TO DEPENDENT RELATIVES OF OFFICERS, ENLISTED MEN, OR NURSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6734) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct," approved May 22, 1928.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NAVAL RESERVE AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5329) to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," as amended by the act of March 2, 1929.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT, SOUTH CHARLESTON, W. VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4657) to authorize the disposition of the naval ordnance plant, South Charleston, W. Va., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a very serious objection to the proceeds of this sale's going into any special fund. If this property has

been declared surplus property, if it is no longer required by the Navy Department, if it is to be sold, then I submit the money ought to be covered into the United States Treasury. If we permit this money to go into a special fund, then the Navy Department will go out and buy another plant.

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. I think there would be no objection whatever to striking out the last words in the bill to the end that the money should go directly into the Treasury.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The disposition of this property is in line with other sales we have had of surplus property. I have no objection to the money's going into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman from Georgia understands my purpose in making the suggestion.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly. I suggest to the gentleman from New York that he offer an amendment to the effect that the money derived from this sale shall go directly to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Let me ask the gentleman from Georgia this question, as he is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs: This plant was purchased for the purpose of building and maintaining an armor-plate plant, was it not?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Now it is thought, after spending several millions of dollars, that it is no longer necessary to keep this plant. Have we the assurance of the gentleman that it is not contemplated to go out and build another plant later on for the same purpose?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may state to the gentleman from New York that in view of the policy now to construct no ships I do not think there is much need of this armor-plate plant here or anywhere else. In all probability the Navy will never again engage in this kind of enterprise.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is it not true that at no time has this plant been put on a production basis?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think it ceased its activity just about the time we spent \$23,000,000 to build it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It never commenced operation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether the gentleman thinks the time is opportune for the disposal of large operating projects and industrial plants similar to the one that is included in this bill?

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. This bill does not provide a mandate that it shall be sold, but it gives authority to the Secretary of the Navy when he sees fit to dispose of it. If he can do that, it will bring about an annual saving of over \$100,000 for custody of the plant, including some 65 civilians who are now employed there and a guard of marines.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I take it that it is not intended that the Secretary of the Navy will enter upon negotiations for its disposal at this particular time?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think he has no intention of doing so within the next six weeks.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know of industrial propositions where there were absolutely no bidders for a plant because it was not a going concern, but was a liability. I would not like to see this property put on the auction block in these times when there is no possibility of realizing anything like a fair value for it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am sure if the Secretary of the Navy can not receive a fair price for it, it will not be offered. Its sale is not made mandatory on his part. It gives him authority to dispose of it; it merely gives him authority to dispose of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there is no protection in the bill; the bill does not say that it shall only be disposed of at a certain price or at a price which represents its fair value.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course no value is set in the bill, but the Secretary of the Navy is not going to sell it if he can not dispose of it at its fair value.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know of many instances where the War Department has made sales way below the market value.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not think any such action will be taken in this instance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask whether the Congressman whose district this plant is in favors the bill? I wish to ask also whether the people in that section will have ample opportunity to voice their objections against the sale of this property, if they have any.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. The people around South Charleston, W. Va., do not object; and the bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to dispose of all or any part of, or interest in, the lands, improvements, and equipment comprising the naval ordnance plant located at South Charleston, W. Va., which includes the armor plant, the projectile plant, and armor and bungalow parks, in like manner and under like terms, conditions, and restrictions as prescribed for the disposition of certain other naval properties by the act entitled "An act to authorize the disposition of lands no longer needed for naval purposes," approved June 7, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 700), and the net proceeds from the sale of said property shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the naval public works construction fund created by section 9 of said act.

With the following committee amendment: Page 2, line 4, after the word "shall," insert the words "after deducting the cost of removing desirable equipment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 2, line 5, after the word "be," strike out the words "deposited in" and insert in lieu thereof the words "covered into," and on page 2, line 5, after the word "Treasury," strike out the words "to the credit of the naval public works construction fund created by section 9 of said act."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is customary to word the amendment to read that the funds are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts? Will the gentleman add the words "as miscellaneous receipts" after the word "Treasury"?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I shall be pleased to. I offer that as a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 2, line 5, after the word "be," strike out the words "deposited in" and insert in lieu thereof the words "covered into," and on page 2, line 5, after the word "Treasury," strike out the words "to the credit of the naval public works construction fund created by section 9 of said act" and add "as miscellaneous receipts."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Minnesota to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of bills, and then it is proposed to take up some suspensions.

If the gentlemen who are looking after the Consent Calendar will remain, the Chair hopes we can call the balance of the calendar after consideration of two or perhaps three motions to suspend the rules.

The Chair makes this statement in view of the fact that some gentlemen have called attention to the fact that there are a number of bridge bills on the Consent Calendar that it is quite important to pass in order that the construction of the bridges may be commenced.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILLIAMS] to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill.

PUBLIC-SCHOOL BUILDING AT FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 13959) to authorize the incorporated town of Fairbanks, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Fairbanks, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporated town of Fairbanks, Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to issue its bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Fairbanks, Alaska: *Provided, however,* That no issue of bonds or other instruments of any such indebtedness shall be made, other than such bonds or other instruments of indebtedness in serial form maturing in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years from the date of the issue of such series, and the last installment not later than 15 years from the date of such issue.

Sec. 2. That before said bonds shall be issued a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the said town of Fairbanks, at which election the question of whether such bonds shall be issued shall be submitted to the qualified electors of said town of Fairbanks whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said town for municipal taxation. Thirty days' notice of such election shall be given by publication thereof in a newspaper printed and published and of general circulation in said town before the day fixed for such election.

Sec. 3. That the registration for such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of said election shall be, as nearly as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law in general or special elections of said municipality, and said bonds shall be issued only upon condition that not less than 65 per cent of the votes cast at such election in said town shall be in favor of issuing said bonds.

Sec. 4. That the bonds above specified, when authorized to be issued as hereinbefore provided, shall bear interest at a rate to be fixed by the common council of the town of Fairbanks, not to exceed 7 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and shall not be sold for less than their par value, with accrued interest, and shall be in denominations not exceeding \$1,000 each: *Provided, however,* That the common council of the said town of Fairbanks may reserve the right to pay off such bonds in their numerical order at the rate of \$20,000 thereof per annum from and after the expiration of five years from the date of issue. Principal and interest shall be payable in lawful money of the United States of America at the office of the town treasurer of the town of Fairbanks, or at such bank in the city of New York, in the State of New York, or such place as may be designated by the common council of the town of Fairbanks, the place of payment to be mentioned in the bonds: *Provided further,* That each and every bond shall have the written signature of the mayor and clerk of said town of Fairbanks, and also bear the seal of said town.

Sec. 5. That no part of the funds arising from the sale of said bonds shall be used for any purpose other than specified in this act. Said bonds shall be sold only in such amounts as the common council shall direct, and the proceeds thereof shall be disbursed for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned and under the order and direction of said common council from time to time as the same may be required for said purposes.

Sec. 6. That the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Fairbanks, Alaska, to issue bonds for the purchasing, construction, and maintenance of an electric light and power plant, telephone system, pumping station, and repairs to the water front, and for other purposes," approved February 7, 1927 (44 Stat. L. 1062), be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5252) providing for payment of \$25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to withdraw from the Treasury so much as may be necessary of the principal fund on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, under section 7 of the act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January

14, 1889, as amended, and to make therefrom payment of \$25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota, under such regulations as such Secretary shall prescribe. No payment shall be made under this act until the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall, in such manner as such Secretary shall prescribe, have accepted such payments and ratified the provisions of this act. The money paid to the Indians under this act shall not be subject to any lien or claim of whatever nature against any of said Indians.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CROP-PRODUCTION LOAN

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 5160) to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1933, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to request the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance to him the balance of the sum authorized to be allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 2 of the act of January 22, 1932, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to make such advances regardless of the amounts of notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations of such corporation that may be outstanding at the time of making such advances, and the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to request the corporation to return all sums heretofore returned and/or released to the corporation by the Secretary of Agriculture, except so much as may have been used by the corporation to establish agricultural credit corporations under section 201(e) of the act of July 21, 1932, which sums, together with the sums collected or to be collected from loans made by the Secretary of Agriculture during the year 1932 under said section 2 of the act of January 22, 1932, shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers during the year 1933 for crop production, planting, fallowing, cultivation, and harvesting: *Provided, however,* That the total sums used for the purposes of this act shall not exceed \$75,000,000. Due consideration shall be given to the requirements of the truck-farming industry in the trucking areas of the various States.

Sec. 2. (a) A first lien on all crops growing or to be planted, grown, and harvested during the year 1933 shall be required as security for such loan. Such loan shall be made through such agencies upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture may require as a condition the making of any loan that the borrower agree to reduce his acreage or production program on such basis, not to exceed 30 per cent, as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and may provide that any such limitation shall not apply to the farmer, tenant, or share cropper who in 1932 planted not more than a minimum acreage of such crops as shall be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 3. (a) The moneys authorized to be loaned by the Secretary of Agriculture under this resolution are declared to be impressed with a trust to accomplish the purposes provided for by this resolution, namely, the production, planting, fallowing, cultivation, and harvesting of crops, which trust shall continue until the moneys loaned pursuant to this resolution have been used for the purposes contemplated by this resolution, and it shall be unlawful for any person to make any material false representation for the purpose of obtaining any loan or to assist in obtaining such loan or to dispose of or assist in disposing of any crops given as security for any loan made under authority of this resolution, except for the account of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to charge a fee for the purpose of preparing or assisting in the preparation of any papers of an applicant for a loan under the provisions of this resolution.

(c) Any person violating any of the provisions of this resolution shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Texas yield before that question is put?

Mr. JONES. If I am permitted to do so, I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in his motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, he would include an amendment which I think is very important and necessary to establish a precedent, and that is that interest on such loans shall not exceed 3 per cent per annum. I think, under the circumstances and under existing conditions, this would be a very wholesome thing to do.

Mr. JONES. I may state to the gentleman that if there is no objection on the part of the House, of course, I would like to have that lower rate of interest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, we will leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the rate of interest.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. In its present form; yes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRIGGS. The amendment offered to the Senate bill is not open to any further amendment in the House?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three minutes. I had hoped that it would not be necessary to extend this provision for another year, but we are all familiar with the conditions as they exist. We had hoped that the Agricultural Credit Corporation would be able to handle it without additional work, but for some reason or other they have not seemed to function.

I hope this is the last bill of its kind that it will ever be necessary to pass. I made a speech on the floor of the House against one of the early bills that was presented. It is not the best method, but this is an emergency. I hope proper and fair credit facilities may be worked out in such a way as to make further actions of this kind unnecessary.

This does not require additional appropriations. It simply provides for the use of some unexpended funds of the previous appropriation. When the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act was pending, 10 per cent was set apart for agriculture. This was not all used. This fund is sufficient to continue the program another year. I had hoped that those controlling the financial affairs of our country would cease to worship an outworn fetish and would give consideration to the living needs of the people in this great, big country. But so far they have not taken the necessary action.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not true that if this bill does not pass it will spell disaster to the farmers?

Mr. JONES. There is no other adequate source of credit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are in an anomalous position to-day considering the full week we spent trying to decrease the production of agricultural products. We spent an entire week passing a bill that had two objects in view—one was to increase the price of agricultural products and the second to decrease the acreage so that there would not be so large a surplus to take care of.

Now, it seems to me that we were either wrong last week or wrong this week. I can not understand how we can explain the situation whereby we were willing to pass a bill for the purpose of increasing prices of farm products which it is estimated would run as high as a billion dollars, and at the same time insist on decreased acreage and then turn around and appropriate \$100,000,000 to do exactly the opposite of what we did last week, for the only purpose that this appropriation can possibly be used for is for increase of acreage of products we reduced last week.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman give us an assurance that that bill will pass the Senate?

Mr. SNELL. I can not; and, in fact, hope not.

Mr. JONES. This bill provides for a cut.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman will agree that if the other becomes a law this ought not to become a law. As a matter of fact, the chairman says in his report that it is not intended to be a continuing appropriation, that it shall not establish a precedent. Does the House appreciate the fact that within the last 12 years we have had 11 of these propositions. It seems to me it is pretty near a precedent at this time.

Now, I am as much interested in the farmer as any man in the House. I come from a rural district where they are all farmers.

I feel that we are helping to destroy the great mass of the agricultural people in this country by creating more credit and increasing farm products and thereby decreasing the price of his product in the market.

Now, if there is no objection, I would like to place a short statement in the Record showing the number of loans and the amount that has been collected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. For your temporary information I will say that the first loan has been collected to the extent of 70 per cent. The next to the extent of 78, the next to 68, the next 44, the next 81, the next 83, and three have been collected above 54 per cent, and the last 42 per cent.

That includes \$25,000,000 collateral, but I do not know what that means. I am sure that we are taking a track directly opposite what we took last week in the matter of farm legislation, and no man has or can present any valid reason why it should be done. These loans are of an entirely different character than any other loans, and specially in view of our action last week.

If there ever was a definite, concrete example of marching up the hill and then marching down, we are doing it by passing this legislation on top of the legislation we passed last week by the overwhelming vote of this House. I rise to call the attention of the House to what we are doing at this time, and in my judgment it is more harmful to the farmers than anything we can possibly do.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I remind the gentleman that in our other Federal loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the railroads, that the other day I read that they are not even paying their interest, while 90 per cent of the farmers in my district repaid these loans.

Mr. SNELL. And in that connection I call the attention of the gentleman, and of the House, to the fact that of the loans made to Florida, only 44.4 per cent have been repaid.

Mr. GREEN. I said in my district.

Mr. SNELL. I refer to the entire loans in the State of Florida.

Mr. GREEN. But is not 44 per cent more than not even paying the interest? The railroads are not paying the interest.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, we spent an entire week in passing legislation that is going to cost the consumers of this country \$1,000,000,000, to do just opposite of what we are proposing to do at the present time, and that is what I call the attention of this House to when they go on record as passing another measure calling for an expenditure of \$75,000,000 or \$100,000,000, to do the opposite of what we did last week. There is no reason on top of earth why we should do both at this time.

Mr. DYER. Is it not in the interest of economy to do it?

Mr. SNELL. If it is, I do not know it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would this increase production?

Mr. SNELL. That is the only reason for passing it. And that is what we tried to cut down last week.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does that necessarily follow? We cut off 20 per cent of production, which would reduce production to 80 per cent, but the farmers must borrow the money to grow the 80 per cent. This is consistent with reduced production.

Mr. SNELL. It is not consistent, and surely the gentleman knows it. The other day we passed legislation which will cost the consumers of the country \$1,000,000,000, and we did it for the purpose of decreasing production, and now here we are appropriating \$75,000,000 for the purpose of increasing production.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; to give them the money so that they can plant the 80 per cent.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, no. It is to increase. If they do not get the money, they will not be able to increase this pro-

duction. The gentleman can not deny that. I append herewith the table referred to.

Record of loans and collections as of January 9, 1933

Appropriation	Amount loaned	Principal	Per cent collected	Interest
Act of Mar. 5, 1921, North-western States, \$2,000,000.	\$1,957,407.20	\$1,377,939.78	70.4	\$122,714.00
Act of Mar. 30, 1922, North-western States, \$1,500,000.	1,480,106.69	1,154,081.27	78.0	60,578.84
Act of Apr. 28, 1924, New Mexico, \$1,000,000.	413,983.15	284,781.41	68.8	23,344.96
Act of Feb. 28, 1927, Florida, \$250,000.	224,204.68	108,347.50	44.4	11,821.50
Act of Feb. 25, 1929, South-eastern States, \$6,000,000.	5,758,650.34	4,679,177.72	81.3	145,516.99
Act of Mar. 3, 1930, North-western, Central, South-eastern States and New Mexico, \$6,000,000.	5,340,727.38	3,376,337.33	63.2	127,436.56
Act of Dec. 20, 1930, drought and storm stricken areas, \$45,000,000.		\$18,177,850.35		177,831.23
Act of Feb. 14, 1931, drought and storm stricken areas, \$20,000,000.	55,787,095.85	\$12,000,000.00	54.0	205,267.79
Act of Feb. 23, 1931, South-eastern States, \$2,000,000.		\$30,177,850.35		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation, act of Jan. 22, 1932.	64,204,503.06	\$10,000,000.00		
		\$16,998,839.62	42.0	1,800,102.80
		26,998,839.62		2,076,905.07

¹ Withheld.

² Cash.

³ Collateral.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, for the last three years I have been advocating the creation of a system of production credit, where farmers might have a place to go to secure funds to produce crops in this country. I am glad to state that they are now establishing these credit corporations. One has already been established at Raleigh, N. C., which will operate in my State, South Carolina, but under the act creating these corporations loans can be made only on what is termed "adequate security." Not one farmer out of 40 in any of the Southern States can qualify under that term and secure loans to produce crops this year.

In reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] as to increasing production, under the loans last year from the Department of Agriculture there was a provision whereby farmers had to agree to reduce their acreage, and we had a reduction of about 10 per cent in the cotton acreage last year, as well as a reduction of from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 bales in the total production of cotton in the United States. This is not a loan to increase production, but it is a loan to assist the farmers in producing bread and meat so that they may be able to carry on. We all agree that this is perhaps an unsound policy and that there will be some waste, but I say further to the gentleman from New York that in the South, with cash payments and cotton as collateral placed with the Department of Agriculture, farmers have already paid 90 per cent, while railroad corporations who borrowed with interest rates much lower than farm loans have not even paid the interest on their loans. Until a real system has been established and agriculture has been rehabilitated, as we hope to do under the allotment plan, this Congress will have to continue this type of loan to the farmers or issue to them a dole with which to feed themselves and their families.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, no legislation better illustrates the growth of national paternalism than the bill under consideration. About 20 years ago the Congress launched on a policy of loaning \$1,000,000 to the farmers for seed loan purposes in the drought-stricken area of North Dakota. That policy has been gradually enlarged and enlarged until to-day we propose to loan money regardless of whether the farmer can obtain the money from the banks. We propose to loan it to all the farmers in the country who will apply. In the emergency act passed last year for the

relief of agriculture it was specifically provided that the loans should be advanced only to those who could not obtain them from private sources. Yet to-day you are adopting a wholesale socialistic policy of coming to the aid of everyone, not compelling them to go first to private establishments, the banking institutions, to get their loans, but are permitting them to come to the Government, and the Government will loan to them at low rates of interest, below the existing rates of interest. You seek to go counter to the existing banking methods of the country by having the Government furnish them money at a low rate of interest. Again I wish to direct attention to the range of its application. It is not to provide relief for distressed farmers, but to farmers generally, without regard to their ability to furnish seed without governmental assistance.

It is to open the vaults of the Treasury to all farmers who may apply. I would be in favor of advancing money to distressed farmers, but this bill seeks to grant authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to curtail the loans where they are needed most, namely, to farmers on the marginal lands, where they are in distress. Under this law the Secretary of Agriculture can restrict the loans unless the people, who are just eking out a bare existence, agree to curtail production to 30 per cent of their production or acreage.

Mr. FULLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. FULLER. Does the gentleman not know that they are charging more interest to the farmers on these loans than they are charging the railroads that are borrowing money?

Mr. STAFFORD. The farmers in my country can get loans at current rates of interest. It was originally proposed that this character of legislation should only be in favor of the distressed farmers who did not have credit but needed a livelihood. Now, you are establishing the wholesale policy that the Government should go into the banking business to the extent of \$75,000,000, to loan to every farmer who may apply. Never in the history of government have we gone to that radical advance of inviting everyone to come and make his bid and then the Government will grant him a loan at low rates of interest, everyone, whether needy or not, receiving the patrimony of the Government, and much of it lost forever. That policy can not be defended.

You seek to revive industry, and yet you are strangling industry and you are strangling the banking institutions of this country by this character of legislation. The next legislation will be to grant loans to every individual, as was proposed by the bill sponsored by the distinguished Speaker of the House, under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Where would we have been under that proposal if it had been adopted? Loaning money to every individual who applied would have required not only \$1,000,000,000, but \$100,000,000,000, because everybody wants money from the United States Treasury at the expense of the general public.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman's premise would be all right if his facts were not all wrong. I would like the gentleman to point out any section or State where the farmer to-day can borrow any money from a private banker.

Mr. STAFFORD. In my country, in the dairying communities. I only know my own country. They can borrow. Every farmer who knows how to farm can borrow. I am not acquainted with the condition in the gentleman's district, but this provides loans to every person, whether in distressed condition or not. By this act you favor the socialistic principle that was negated by your great Democratic President, Andrew Jackson, when he vetoed the second national United States Bank. It is socialistic in the extreme.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman say that the Iowa farmers can borrow money?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not yield to the gentleman. My time has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] says that the banks of that great State stand ready to loan to the agricultural interests of the State all the money that is necessary for the farming industry. There were 7,000 people in the gentleman's State last year who applied to the Government for crop-production loans; they certified to the Secretary of Agriculture that they were unable to borrow money from any source in the great State of Wisconsin, to carry on their farming enterprises. [Applause.] Nearly 7,000 of the applications were approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. In doing so he said it was impossible for these farmers to obtain loans from any source, bankers or otherwise, throughout the entire State of Wisconsin; and yet the gentleman tells the membership of this House that he knows all about his own State, and knows the farmers can borrow ample funds from the bankers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I did not assume that.

Mr. LARSEN. Well, the gentleman said it, whether he assumed it or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not all. The people from Wisconsin have been unable to repay the loans. Those 7,000 people, most of them heads of families and all of farming institutions in that great State, may be compelled to go out and beg bread upon the highways if Representatives from their own State are unwilling to serve them. The gentleman from Wisconsin and others who claim to be liberal were willing to appropriate \$2,800,000,000 for the industries of this country. [Applause.] That is what we have done. Oh, yes; it is all right to appropriate billions to be loaned to industry, but when we would appropriate a few millions for distressed agriculture it becomes paternalistic and is wrong.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, no one can realize the present difficult situation of the farmers of our country without being distressed.

To aid him is a true objective, but to depart from fundamentally sound principles of government to do so, as is proposed in this bill, makes it difficult.

Loans for crop production, seed loans, and so forth, when we are all hollering like hallelujah about surpluses is an anomaly in legislation. This bill proposes to encourage increases in surpluses to add to our troubles.

For years a few of us have been opposing this idea of seed loans, for it has been established by precedent over a long period of years; but there are growing numbers on both sides of the aisle that silently protest now that will audibly express themselves when times become more nearly normal.

The theory of educating our farmers to more and more depend for aid upon their Government is also fundamentally unsound. Self-help generates self-respect. Let the producers of our farm commodities get into their co-operatives, learn to function with and follow the leadership chosen by the majority, and let them learn to fight their enemies from without. When farmers present a solid front they will be on their way to an economic heaven instead of wandering around in an uneconomic hell.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER].

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised at the logic that has been advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. I saw the gentleman from New York stand on the floor last week and fight the agriculture bill. The gentleman says he comes from an agricultural district. Now, the gentleman says that this bill is in reverse to that; that the bill will increase the supply in this country to a point where it will be hurtful. I think the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'CONNOR, answered the gentleman from New York, Mr. SNELL, very fully when he said it was not for that purpose, but it was for the purpose of allowing those farmers to raise a crop on the 80 per cent which they are dependent upon for a living next year. I

say to you that agricultural loans of this kind have been paid in a better percentage than any other loans that have been made by this Government of which I have any knowledge.

I assert to you that many of the farmers of our Southland—I do not know what the condition is in other places—if this loan is not made, can not get money to make a crop with at all. They make a crop for their own consumption; it is not for the market so much. After they pay this loan back the most of it will be consumed in their own homes to take care of those who will be in need if they can not have this help to make a crop. Not only that but if we make this loan and if we have better conditions, as we hope to have, the loans will all be paid. The second loans will all be paid if those who got them make money enough to pay them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the committee did not put into this bill some safeguard which would assure the public that this great amount of money would be properly administered and accounted for through our accounting agency.

Only a month ago the crop production and seed loan office had 667 men traveling around this country in automobiles trying to collect money from the poor farmers when a letter addressed to them under a frank would have done just as well as a private call. They get an average of over \$10 a day, including expenses and the gas used in their automobiles, nearly \$7,000 a day. They have thousands in the various regional offices. We should put a stop to such waste, and it should be done on this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture or his subordinates made this legislation not a relief bill for farmers but a relief bill for eight members of a football team in the city of Washington, members of the Washington University football team. Jobs were created for them in the Washington office to enable them to work after school hours.

A former Missourian, who was one of our leading football players some years ago, is now coach of the Washington University football team. I do not know if he had the necessary influence with the Secretary of Agriculture, also from Missouri, to get eight of his men work, but some one did, and they are on the pay roll. They are not loaning money now but collecting money, and I wonder what was the need for these great athletes. This is just an example of what happens when we make a lump-sum appropriation and do not place any safeguards around the expenditures when it comes to administration.

The real complaint I have, however, is that here is a public official, the Secretary of Agriculture, who declines to let the General Accounting Office audit his accounts. It does not seem reasonable, but nevertheless it is a fact. I hope the Senate places on this bill a paragraph that will require the Secretary to permit the Comptroller to go over his expenditures, the same as all other expenditures of the Government. If permitted, I would offer an amendment, but the rules will not allow this. It is nothing short of a scandal the way all these loans have been handled. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire or intention to attempt a discussion of the pending proposal, and the merits of its provisions, in the brief period of time allotted to me. Chairman JONES and others have already clearly outlined the purpose of the resolution. I merely wish to observe that had it not been for the extension of too much credit in the past, of which the farmers have availed themselves, Congress would not be called upon at the present time to pass this kind of a resolution. It is because the farmers have been encouraged and urged to borrow extensively in times of expansion, when land values and

other farm values have been high, that so many farmers are in desperate circumstances at the present time, and are in need of this assistance from the Federal Government.

I have often said, and I here repeat, that more credit never has, does not now, and never will furnish the necessary means of obtaining an effective solution of the farm problem. The farmers need credit, that is true, but they need a different kind of credit, and not necessarily more credit. They need the kind of credit which will afford them more time in which to meet their obligations, the kind of credit which will provide a lower rate of interest; a rate of interest which they can afford to pay out of their incomes, obtained from the sale of their commodities.

There is something else, however, which the farmers need more than they do a different kind of credit. The farmers need, and must have, an increased buying power of their commodities if the agricultural industry is to be saved. The best and most effective method of obtaining that result would be through a properly regulated expansion of our currency. In other words, the value of the American dollar must be stabilized upon a more equitable basis. Under present conditions the farmers can not acquire the necessary number of dear dollars to pay taxes, interest, and other obligations, including those debts which they incurred with cheap dollars a decade or more ago. The American farmers are not asking for more credit, but for better prices so that they can pay the debts which they have already incurred.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak except for the assertion that has been made that these loans will stimulate production. Superficially this might seem to be the case, and yet I know from my own experience and my own inquiries in the matter that this result does not necessarily follow.

Last fall I made some inquiry concerning this matter because I was trying through the Secretary of Agriculture to procure loans for winter-wheat planting. I wrote to every county agent in my district and to a number of bankers. I asked them what would be the result as far as increasing or decreasing acreage was concerned if these loans could not be procured. Almost universally the answer was that failure to procure these loans on the part of the actual farmer would not result in any curtailment of production. It would result perhaps in the farmer going out of business and having to leave his farm, but some one else, some one in town, a neighboring farmer or some one with capital would put that land into cultivation. That prediction has been borne out in my district because the reduction in wheat acreage has been practically nothing this last year and what reduction has taken place has been due entirely to weather conditions, yet there have been hundreds and perhaps thousands of farmers who did not put out a crop because they were not able to secure funds. That land has been put into crop nevertheless. I am in favor of acreage reduction, but am not in favor of attempting to secure it by forcing farmers to give up their farms because they do not have the capital with which to operate. This is bad policy from both an economic and social standpoint. Under the provisions of this bill the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to require a reduction in acreage of as much as 30 per cent, and this authority I am sure will prevent any overproduction of surplus crops.

Now, I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has never seen one of these loan applications and does not understand the showing that a farmer must make in order to get one of these loans, or he would not say that we are extending universal credit to the farmers of this country. No farmer who can get funds anywhere else is going to want one of these crop loans because he will not be willing to meet the conditions that are imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture in the making of these loans.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the existing law such a provision was required, but under the bill now under consideration no such requirement is carried.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if I can add anything to what has already been said on this measure. On the first day of the session I introduced a bill to provide for renewal of these seed loans for the year 1933. I declare to this House, with all the seriousness at my command, that I consider this the most vital and the most necessary piece of emergency legislation that we can quickly pass and send on to the people in the agricultural sections of this country. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRIGGS] when he said that if this measure would fail there would be disaster has, indeed, expressed it mildly.

Let us see what some of the Southern States have done in the matter of repayment, because I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has left a wrong impression here. On the loans last year alone, the State of Alabama has repaid 81 per cent, Arkansas 75 per cent, Georgia 94 per cent, Louisiana 94 per cent, Mississippi 77 per cent, North Carolina 91 per cent, Oklahoma 59 per cent, South Carolina 87 per cent, Tennessee 56 per cent, and Texas 88 per cent.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I did not intend to call attention to any part of the country about the repayment. I took them in the order they came, but the gentleman from Florida asked me the question, so I told him about the Florida loans. I put the entire statement in the RECORD just as I received it from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WARREN. Now the gentleman from Wisconsin stands up here and tells us we should exhaust every effort to obtain loans from banks and other sources. The average man knows that the farmer has already exhausted all those sources.

Last spring, I am sure, a large percentage of the Members of the House thought that when we amended the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act and enlarged its base so as to set up these agricultural-credit corporations, the seed-loan problem would be solved in the future. They have set up 12 of these regional banks with 33 branches; and yet, under the stringent and unwise regulations prescribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, these organizations, created for a worthy purpose, which have been set up in every section of this Nation, are absolutely worthless. They either ought to be broadened or we ought to wipe out the whole thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, there is one provision in the House substitute for the Senate bill which is not in the Senate bill itself and which, I think, is rather significant. It is this:

Due consideration shall be given to the requirements of the truck-farming industry in the trucking areas of the various States.

This provision was doubtless put in the bill as an inducement to the Members of the House from so-called metropolitan areas to support the legislation. I would call it a sop to the Members from those areas. The truck-farming interests will receive no benefit from this kind of legislation. They are not engaged in the kind of farming which can benefit from it. You can not induce a truck farmer with 2 or 3 or 5 acres of land to curtail his production 30 per cent; neither can you regulate his production in any such way as is contemplated by this bill. I think, perhaps, it was also intended as an inducement for support to the dairying interests. I dare say you will not find this legislation helpful to them. They will not be able to comply

are armed to the teeth and are still consuming a large part of the products of their genius and their toil in building up armaments for the destruction of their fellow men and the ruination of their sister nations. When the same regard for each other's rights which now exists between individuals in civilized countries is manifested between nations, war will cease and thus make profitable leisure for the peoples of all countries so that they may have an opportunity to become wiser and more helpful to all others.

No sensible man will resort to deadly weapons to settle his dispute and no sane nation should. Let us remember that no armament could ever be built big enough, by the biggest nation, to be bigger than that of any other great nation, save temporarily. No nation can ever have the biggest armament if even one other nation combines with its adversary. A false premise can not make a right conclusion. In the light of the immediate terrible past and of the awful present, all the seas can not drown the stupidity of further gigantic preparations for war.

So great are our trials in these turbulent and troublesome times that we are literally forced by the sheer conditions that confront us to stop, look, and listen in order that we may find our way once more to solid ground. If we but reflect momentarily, we shall see that four words tell the story of the world's great worries to-day—armament, war, destruction, debt.

COST OF PREPARATION

Armament is still costing the world each year well-nigh \$4,000,000,000. With this sum the world could retire most of its public debt, whether foreign or domestic, in the course of a few years. The last war was directly responsible for the death of at least 20,000,000 human beings. Its average daily cost was more than \$150,000,000 to the world. The aggregate direct and indirect cost exceeded the stupendous figure of \$330,000,000,000.

So terrible was the aftermath of that titanic struggle that the nations have not been able to lower their obligations since fighting ceased. So much debt, such tremendous outlay for something already destroyed, utterly annihilated and absolutely nonproductive, has almost ruined the world.

It seems to me that the solution of all other problems can wait until we take this first step in the progressive disarmament of the world. Unless the nations of the earth are prepared forthwith to stop spending their income on armament, nobody can predict the decadence that shall necessarily befall the peoples of the earth.

Therefore, let us now strike at the root of this evil. If we could induce all parties in all countries to unite to save the world from disaster, if in solemn mood and hopeful prayer all peoples would forget all minor measures and unite on a different course of procedure in order to solve the armament problem, if all men and women in this country and all countries were to turn their backs upon war and turn their faces toward peace, we should soon righteously settle this momentous problem.

To that end, let us join in the one single proposal, unfettered and unhampered by any other international problem whatever, and unanimously declare to the nations of the world that we are prepared to reduce our armament to a size commensurate with national safety and sane expenditure along with like decreases in all the other countries of the world. It is my own deliberate judgment that all the international troubles of the world—and many of its national difficulties, which it is proposed to solve by various conferences—will come within the range of easy management once the great cause of disarmament has been set right. Let us endeavor to settle forthwith this fundamental world problem about which there can surely be no dispute here or in any other civilized land. If out of this world depression can come world disarmament, we shall not have suffered in vain; but if we continue in our bewilderment and let this opportunity pass, the peoples of the world may well charge that we are unworthy of the mighty trust placed in our hands.

THE OFFER

It will be recalled that Mussolini asked for a 50 per cent reduction in world armaments, but to that request the nations gave no heed. It will be remembered that President Hoover suggested a one-third reduction in the size of armies, but the nations of the world did not accede to that request.

A disarmament conference recently closed its session in Geneva, having deliberated upon this question for many months, one of our own eminent and conspicuous Members, Senator SWANSON, being an honored representative of our country, but slight if any progress was made toward the solution of the problem.

What does the Senate of the United States propose to do about it? Are we to admit that we are powerless in the presence of this great problem? Can we offer no suggestion that will save a debt-burdened and war-cursed world from present debts or from future wars? Senators, for one, I am not willing to admit that we are entirely powerless to aid in the solution of this problem. And because of my belief I offer the following resolution, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It asks for a reduction of but 5 per cent each year for the next 10 years, or a total of 41 per cent in the aggregate. This would leave ample armament for the protection and defense of every nation, and yet it would largely solve all the problems that grow out of the present armament construction of the world. It would at once give the peoples of all lands to understand that from this time henceforth armaments are not to be increased, and that would mark an epoch in the progressive march of civilization; for whenever the nations are thoroughly satisfied that no larger armies are to be equipped and no greater navies are to be constructed, and that no larger sums are to be expended for these purposes, then, indeed, will there be a feeling of intense satisfaction run throughout the world, which will tend to restore confidence in the hearts of all people and bring about a happier situation in the world.

And, again, it will decrease the annual burden now laid upon the backs of the people in the form of taxes to equip armies and build battleships, and this most assuredly is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

It is a modest suggestion, but after all it is probably the best that can be obtained at this time, if, indeed, it can be; but certainly it is worth the effort.

If the Senate will pass this resolution—if other legislative bodies afflicted and burdened by armament construction will do the same—we shall at least have a concrete proposition to submit to the nations of the world, and out of it should come that glorious condition foretold of old when "nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and learn war no more forever."

I thank the Senator from Virginia; and I ask the clerk to read the resolution and ask its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. HALE. When the Senator speaks of a 5 per cent reduction, I take it that before such a reduction is made he would want the United States to come up to the proportionate strength permitted her under the Washington and London treaties; would he not?

Mr. WATSON. That is a technical question to which I can not give adequate answer. I recall—and I am entirely willing to say this outside the speech—that we got decidedly the worst of the bargain in the Washington conference. There is no question in the world about that. We really did do the thing that we promised to do, and I am well aware of the fact that other nations did not. But I do not care to get into that kind of a controversy. That is for the Committee on Foreign Relations; and I trust that my good friend

a lift from the Federal Treasury through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, you say that is for the best interest of the country and for business in general, and vote for it; but now when the farmers need a loan, you charge paternalism. Well, if granting a loan to the destitute farmers of my district is paternalism, then I am for it.

They need loans immediately. The planting season in my State is rapidly approaching; the growers in some cases have already prepared their soil and need funds with which to buy seed and fertilizer. This bill will provide such assistance. Truck, strawberry, and vegetable growers will be permitted loans for planting any time during the year. If their crop is planted in the fall of 1933, as is the case with strawberries, they can obtain the loan, plant and cultivate their crops, and repay the Government from sales of their crop early in 1934. This is the very relief our people are demanding, and we should help them to support themselves by passing this bill.

New appropriation is not required. Funds formerly appropriated for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be used to make the loans, also funds collected from previous loans. I realize that the American people can not borrow themselves out of debt; but as long as the Government allows loans to big banks, big railroads, insurance companies, and other big business, then our growers and farmers must have theirs. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. For some time I have been seeking the immediate passage of this measure and appeared with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] before the Rules Committee where we obtained a special rule. Farmers should know at once if this loan is available in order to make the arrangements for the 1933 crop. Without this aid many will not be able to make a crop. In the past this money has not been available until after planting time. Since preparations are made and the crop planted earlier in the South, it is hoped and expected the applications and loans will soon be available.

It is true, as here contended, that it is poor policy for the Government to continue loaning money for seed and crop purposes. It is equally true it is poor policy, such as has been pursued, to loan large sums of money to banks, insurance companies, and railroads. But in these trying times, with financial disaster staring most of us in the face, all rules fail. Since agriculture is the basic industry of this country, it should be given first aid. A much larger per cent of the Federal money loaned to farmers for crop purposes will be paid than that to large financial institutions.

It is not a case of policy but a case of necessity. In most of the agricultural communities, due to bank failures, a scarcity of money, inability to collect, and a fear to deposit with banks make it impossible for the farmers to borrow from banks for any purpose, not even for seed. Last year the farmers did not get back the cost of production on account of low prices. It took their first money to pay their seed loans. It now means if they do not receive this aid, many will be unable to make a crop.

In my district are many orchardists who are unable to produce a crop without extensive spraying and the use of fertilizer. The bill covers these items. Hundreds are required to borrow at least \$1,000 each, which is secured by the crop and in practically every instance it is promptly repaid. No money is available for this purpose except as borrowed from the Government. It means everything to the small farmer and horticulturist. It is hoped the bill will pass and the law speedily administered.

Were amendments in order, I should insist upon a lower rate of interest and hope the Conference Committee will insert such a clause. The Government should not hope to profit on this kind of loan. While I know it is contended the higher rate of interest is charged to cover overhead expenses and make up for poor and worthless loans, the better policy would be to start work on the loans at once, thus having time to overcome the rush period, entail-

ing extra expense, and make better and safer loans. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to state in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin that there have been more loans in the Northwest—the district in which the gentleman's State is located—than in any other section of America, and that district has paid back a smaller percentage of the loans than any other part of the country. I say this not in criticism but as an evidence of the need regardless of the gentleman's opinion.

Two or three Members from that section came to me just before the measure was presented and urged that an additional provision to take care of feeding stock be included, claiming that they had no other means or credit or feed, and that their livestock were starving. The gentleman from Wisconsin stood here and raised all kinds of objections to these small loans to farmers, but he said nothing about the billions that were loaned to industry through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Why is it sound to lend to the big industrial concerns and unsound to lend to farmers? If the Government is to furnish credit for the one, why not for the other?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment which has the approval of all the members of the Agricultural Committee that I have consulted, and will be of marked benefit to the Government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "farmer," insert "and approved by the local farm organization."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I object.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at the end of section 2 limiting the interest to 3 per cent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 4, after the word "agriculture," add the following: "interest on such loans shall not exceed the rate of 3 per cent per annum."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNELL and Mr. JENKINS) there were 178 ayes and 69 noes.

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WHITE. I object.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF AMERICAN GOODS

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 10743) to require the purchase of domestic supplies for public use and the use of domestic materials in public buildings and works.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act—

(a) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof;

(b) The terms "public use," "public building," and "public work" shall mean use by, public building of, and public work of the United States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless inconsistent with the public interest, or unless the cost is unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have

been manufactured in the United States wholly of articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, or to be used for experimental or scientific purposes, or if articles, materials, or supplies of the class or kind to be used are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) Every contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States shall contain a provision that in the performance of the work the contractor and all subcontractors shall, so far as practicable, and unless the cost is unreasonable, use only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States wholly of articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States.

(b) If the head of a department, bureau, agency, or independent establishment which has made any contract containing the provision required by subsection (a) finds that in the performance of such contract there has been a failure to comply with such provision, he shall make public his finding, including therein the name of the contractor obligated under such contract, and no other contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or elsewhere shall be awarded to such contractor, or to any partnership, association, or corporation with which such contractor is associated or affiliated, within a period of three years after such finding is made public.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect 60 days after its enactment, but shall not apply to any contract entered into prior to such effective date or to any contract that may be entered into after such effective date pursuant to invitations for bids that are outstanding at the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is there any gentleman on the Republican side, a member of the committee, opposed to the bill? If not, is there any Member on the Democratic side, a member of the committee, opposed to the bill? If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many of the appropriation bills have carried limitations in requiring Government officials, where the cost is not unreasonable, to purchase American-made goods. This bill seeks to cover all Government agencies. There is ample protection in section 2 for the Government, which provides the administrative officials have the right to purchase goods outside of this country if the bids received for domestic goods are not fair and reasonable.

I want to say that the necessity for this legislation at this time is due to the fact that the Interior Department, the Bureau of Reclamation, is soon to ask proposals for two sets of turbines to be used in the West and the contracts will amount to \$3,000,000 each. There is no provision in the bill appropriating the money that will give this work to American industry. If this legislation is not enacted, the work is going to Germany, because the American concerns can not compete with them.

Hearings were held and everyone was given an opportunity to be heard. The hearings showed where our Government has been buying material from abroad. Italian marble is being used in our new Supreme Court Building. I could go along for an hour and point out the necessity for this legislation. In times such as we are now experiencing let us put American labor to work on Government supplies and material. The bill carries a unanimous report from the committee. I now yield to the gentleman from New York for a question.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this legislation, but I notice the following language on page 2 of the bill:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless inconsistent with the public interest, or unless the cost is unreasonable—

And so forth. Who is going to determine that?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The Government officials.

Mr. REED of New York. The Government officials? Is it proposed to leave that entirely to Government officials?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The Comptroller General, as the gentleman knows, passes on all contracts.

Mr. REED of New York. That leaves a very broad discretion.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The law requires the Comptroller General to approve the contracts. He is a mighty trustworthy official.

Mr. REED of New York. I know; but this puts it in the hands of one man here, and we know how they have operated a lot of these other contracts. I question whether that language sufficiently insures the purposes of the bill.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. SWING. Is the bill intended to cover food and clothing, or only building material?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It says materials and supplies. I am sure one would consider clothing as supplies.

Mr. SWING. If the Army or the Navy were buying canned peaches, for instance, and in the canning of the peaches Cuban sugar was used, would that prevent the Government from buying those peaches?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman goes a little too far. I believe the word "supplies" covers food supplies, but the purchasing officer has some discretion.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. Why would it not be advisable to incorporate in this bill a provision requiring employment of local labor in the city or the vicinity where the building is to be erected?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That is already in existing law. We do not want to load up this bill with amendments.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Take, for instance, rubber tires, or silk, or linen thread, or sheeting. These articles are not made wholly from articles grown here. Therefore, they may not be purchased by the Government. Is not that the fact?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Oh, no; the bill provides that they shall not be purchased unless it be inconsistent with the public interest. It might be to the interest of the Government to purchase such supplies, and they would have a right to purchase wherever any article of that kind is not manufactured in the United States if it was needed. It would be inconsistent with the public interest not to buy them.

Mr. GRANFIELD. It is the gentleman's contention that the provisions of the bill cover the situation.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under the parliamentary situation at this time I can not offer an amendment; however, at the close of the debate on this bill I shall offer an amendment, on page 2, line 14, after the word "used," to insert the following: "or the articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to require Government establishments to purchase articles which are grown or produced or manufactured in the United States, as the case may be, in preference to competitive foreign articles, even though the cost be more, provided that the excess of cost is not unreasonable. I favor this purpose.

This bill, however, fails to give the Government the protection which it ought to have, although evidently it has sought to do so. The bill, on page 2, line 7, provides that the Government may purchase only such manufactured articles as are made in the United States "wholly of articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States." It then provides, in line 10:

This section shall not apply * * * if articles of the class or kind to be used are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States.

This covers the situation where the articles to be used by the Government—for instance, raw coffee—are not produced in the United States; but it does not cover the case where the material used in manufacture in the United States, such as rubber or silk or magnesite, is not produced here.

Take, for instance, rubber tires or silk or linen thread or sheeting. These articles are not made wholly from articles grown here. Therefore, they may not be purchased unless the excepting clause covers them. But the excepting clause applies only where the article to be used, such as tires, thread, or sheets, are not manufactured here. The articles under consideration clearly are, and so are not excepted from the prohibition against purchase.

This difficulty, which to my mind is unintentional, can be cured by inserting on page 2, line 14, after the word "used" the words "or the articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured." The sentence will then read:

This section shall not apply * * * if articles, materials, or supplies of the class or kind to be used or the articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured, are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States.

The excepting clause would then cover the case where an essential material used by the American manufacturers can not be obtained in the United States, as well as the case where the article desired to be used by the Government can not be obtained here. This is obviously a necessity and is required to insure the protection of our own manufacturers as well as the interests of the Government.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] contends that in view of the language, "unless inconsistent with the public interest or unless the cost is unreasonable," on page 2, section 2, line 2, of the bill, that the amendment which I intend to offer later is unnecessary, and that the language of the bill to which I have just referred makes it possible to sell to the Government articles manufactured from foreign materials, provided the price of the article intended for purchase proved to be unreasonable in cost and inconsistent with the public interest. I trust the gentleman's opinion is a sound one.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish a policy by the Government assuring the use of American materials for the execution and carrying on of public works in every place where the United States has jurisdiction, and appropriations for that purpose are made by the Congress. First, a Government department or agency responsible for the execution of a contract, may require the contractor to whom the award is made to give assurance that in the execution of that project for public use or public works and for supplies, if certain raw materials are used, a preference shall be given to raw materials mined or produced wholly within the United States, and they shall be acquired and used when not inconsistent with the public interest, and where the cost is not unreasonable. That applies to the raw material going into public works. Second, manufactured materials shall be given preference when the raw materials are produced or mined in the United States out of which the manufactured article is made, wholly within the United States by American labor. That ought to be fair. Next, if the raw product is made abroad and the manufactured article is made within the United States, that manufactured article would be given preference over articles of the same kind, being imported, where the raw product is produced abroad and the manufactured article from which it is made also produced in other countries. That establishes a definite policy that ought to meet the approval of every American citizen in carrying out a public-works program in America.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I am in favor of the bill, but there is a very large industry in New York City which imports raw mahogany logs, the fabrication of which is done within the United States by American citizens. Would that industry be affected by this legislation?

Mr. WILSON. Not unless it should be true that mahogany logs were produced in the United States and sent to New York and there manufactured, or elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. BACON. In this case, of course, no mahogany is grown in the United States; but, on the other hand, the fabrication of those logs furnishes a great deal of hand labor in the city of New York. It is all 100 per cent American labor.

Mr. WILSON. They would not be excluded, but rather would be protected against the importation of mahogany products made abroad.

Mr. BACON. I simply used that as an illustration to bring out the point.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER] and I have worked very diligently to bring about legislation that would give fair consideration to American products and to American labor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Further pursuing the subject of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], would walnut or any other kind of lumber compete successfully with these mahogany logs, if the walnut were grown in the United States?

Mr. WILSON. If manufactured in the United States, and if they were satisfactory to serve the same purpose, then, unless it was inconsistent with the public interest or the cost was unreasonable, you would use the walnut logs.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In other words, walnut or pine would have the preference over mahogany?

Mr. WILSON. If it served the same purpose and met the approval of the department having control under this bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. This bill is not sufficiently broad to include labor?

Mr. WILSON. Oh, no. That would come from the Committee on Labor, but it would bring to American labor the payment of many millions of dollars every year, and the use of American products for American purposes every year.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will it bring reprisals against American goods?

Mr. WILSON. We could not apply that in this bill. The gentleman would have to go to the Committee on Ways and Means or some other committee as to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the question which was just asked by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD], to my mind is very significant. Would this bill encourage reprisals? To my mind, that is exactly what this bill will do. It will encourage reprisals. You cause irritation. You are simply pouring salt on an open wound. In one breath we are trying to adjust the very delicate international debt settlements and in the next breath we are putting a "bar sinister" upon European-made goods, and slapping in the face those nations with whom we are endeavoring to make debt adjustments. How we Democrats, at the threshold of a new administration, attempting to settle these very difficult and delicate questions, can vote for such a bill is quite beyond me. I urge the men on my side to think twice before they vote for this bill, and to put "thumbs down" on it. Let us not "hamstring" the new administration and its attempts to placate irritated and ruffled Europe.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It is my impression that almost every country in the world has a similar limitation for Government purchases of materials and supplies.

Mr. CELLER. I have not heard so, and I very much doubt that. I should like to look into that subject. But that is no reason for supporting the bill. Somebody must make a beginning and stop the spite work. Why breed more retaliation? We put up high tariff walls and Canada and other nations do the same thing and go us one better, and we retaliate by going still higher, and both are perched

upon the walls thumbing noses at each other. Thereby we congeal trade. We freeze trade. We must do something to take care of the log jam. We must open the channels of trade. This bill closes the marts of commerce. Life, after all, is not so much logical as it is psychological.

Psychologically you do a grievous wrong to the European nations, particularly at this time, if you pass this bill.

The foreign press, the foreign chauvinists, will exaggerate its importance. Demagogues in Europe will use it for their selfish ends. It is very easy to stand here and drape yourself in the American flag and say this is a highly patriotic proposition. To my mind it is unpatriotic. I would rather say it is patriotic to increase trade than to decrease trade, which will be done by this bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. How much farther does this bill go than existing law in aiming to prescribe that only American-made materials shall be used in public construction?

Mr. CELLER. I do not care how far this bill goes beyond any other bill. This is the most inopportune time to raise this question, when we are trying to settle much more difficult questions. This bill is chauvinism to the nth degree. I am opposed to it for that reason. We are always told that our prosperity lies in our exportable surplus. That is our profit in this land. We can not consume all we produce. About 85 or 90 per cent of what we make or produce we use. The 10 or 15 per cent is supposed to go abroad. It is the failure of its going abroad that gives us the depression. This bill postpones still further its going abroad.

Furthermore, we are a dependent, not an independent America. We are not self-sufficient. We could not last for 30 days without dependence upon Canada, Europe, and the rest of the world. The war taught us that. Take our national defense alone. The war taught us that we must get from abroad at least 30 specific materials essential to the prosecution of war. They are called "strategic" materials in the sense that they are absolutely necessary for successful national defense. Most of them we do not produce, and as to the others, during the war we did not produce them at all. These materials are as follows: Antimony, camphor, chromium, coffee, cork, graphite, hemp, hides, iodine, jute, flaxseed, manganese, manila fiber, mica, nickel, nux vomica, opium, platinum, potassium salts, quicksilver, quinine, rubber, shellac, silk, sodium nitrate, sugar, tin, tungsten, vanadium, wool. Now, however, we are producing camphor, iodine, potash salts, quinine, and sodium nitrate.

There is stern reality here. Not only do we need every one of these articles in war, but we need them in peace. It is easy enough to get up and make a spread-eagle speech. By doing so, however, one only hornswaggles. Let any of the producing countries put an embargo on any of these items, and you would jolly well see how dependent America really is. I would not be surprised if an embargo were placed against us on one or more of these articles that we do not now produce. Certainly, if we continue to build higher our own tariff walls and pass measures of this character, there is no doubt but that embargoes will ensue.

One of the items mentioned is nickel. Let us examine nickel for a moment. Nickel is used for ordnance, armor plate, bridges, rails, shafting, axles, sugar-mill equipment, glass works, chemical equipment, in paper machinery, electrical instruments, parts of refrigeration plants, and in automobiles. As monel metal it is used in oil refineries, salt works, laundries, dairies, hotels, hospitals, ice-cream plants, and soda fountains. It has universal application. We get it from Canada. The Lord help us if Canada refuses to sell it to us.

In the same way, we get rubber from the East Indies, felt from Australia, tin out of the Andes, tungsten from Sweden, nitrate from Chile, vanadium from Norway. So dependent are we that we could not make ink were it not for Asia.

These are ties that bind, because in return for these articles we ship our farm machinery, our typewriters, our adding machines, our milling machines, and a score of apparatus.

This bill would upset these exchanges and destroy the life of trade. This bill is yet another blow at business, which is now prostrate.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. In face of the Ottawa agreement, does the gentleman think we are raising the issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE] that we are a great deal to blame for the Ottawa conference. Years ago we had a reciprocity treaty with Canada and trade between the two countries was vigorous. Then there came a time when intense nationalism dominated Canada and our own Nation and the treaty was abrogated. Since that time tariff walls have been built higher and higher and higher. The blame is on both sides. We are not blameless. Canada is also culpable. Just as soon as we passed the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill they put a tremendous tariff on our dairy products and on our fruits and on our articles grown in New England and we became the sufferers. It was like spitting in the wind. Our trade with Canada is languishing. Americans go to Canada with their capital, erect their plants and factories, and try to avoid the Canadian tariff, and it has been estimated that over \$93,000,000 was the flight of American capital to Canada during the last year. We must stop that business. We must tell the world that we want the world's good will. We want peace—industrial peace. We want to give and take.

If we insist upon payment of debts, how in thunder can they pay us if we will not trade with them?

We do not want to erect, as I said a moment ago, this Chinese wall around us, keeping all other nationals out, keeping all trade out; and I understand that now they are trying even to keep European art objects, actors, and artists out of this country. How can we maintain good will and encourage good feeling in this manner?

Mr. WHITE. I certainly feel we should not always be the last.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, acting with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Expenditures, I helped draft this bill and I have asked for this time to make a further explanation to the Members why the bill is in the shape it is now.

We made an attempt early in our work on this bill to draft a very complicated series of preferences, by which goods entirely manufactured in this country from entirely American material, would be given first choice; goods manufactured in America partly from foreign materials and partly from American materials would come next, and so on down the line. We found before we got very far that it meant a complicated list of 9 or 10 different preferences and it was almost impossible to work them out fairly because it would be so difficult to assign in the ultimate value how much weight should attach to the different sources of manufacture or raw material. We realized that the important thing to do was to lay down in general terms the intention of Congress, that the Federal Government and also contractors having to do with the Federal Government, should use American goods where possible and where it was a reasonable and proper thing to do.

There is no attempt here to work out any kind of law that will bring reprisals from other countries. We are only doing in this what foreign governments have done for many years. No foreign government to-day buys anything in this country that it can buy in its own country. Our country is the only one which is doing that.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. May I ask the gentleman who is going to be the judge of when it is consistent or inconsistent with public interest?

Mr. HOLLISTER. The discretion must, of course, be left to the heads of the departments. If there is such an abuse of discretion as to be clearly an abuse, there is no question but that the comptroller would not allow the expenditure.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am interested as it applies to the supplies to be used by the Navy. Take, for instance, canned goods put up in California wherein Cuban sugar is used. Will this bill interfere with the purchase by the Navy of such supplies?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I should not think it would.

Mr. BRITTEN. There is nothing in the bill that guarantees that it will not?

Mr. HOLLISTER. There is no specific exception; no.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman has indicated that he has made a really complete study of this. I wonder if the gentleman could make a statement as to how far behind other countries the United States is in buying for its use things made in its own country.

Mr. HOLLISTER. I could not give the exact figure, but this is the only Government, as far as I am advised, that does not buy all the things it possibly can locally but buys some of them outside the country.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. What has the gentleman to say of the provision that excepts goods used for experimental and scientific purposes and allows them to be purchased by the Government outside the United States?

Mr. HOLLISTER. Because it was pointed out that it was very essential that the Army and Navy have authority to purchase such things outside of the country that they might test them and see whether there was adequate local competition and decide also whether the foreign article was better than the one they could get in this country.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Then the language in the first three lines of the bill weakens it?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I repeat that in drawing this bill the purpose of the committee was to express a general policy for the Government. We merely tried to express general principles and make them as binding as we reasonably could.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. How under this bill could Cuban sugar be used in canned goods for the use of the Government when good Montana or Colorado sugar was just as available?

Mr. HOLLISTER. If it were just as available, I should think it probably could not be.

Mr. LEAVITT. It seems to me the sugar producers of this country could prohibit the use of Cuban sugar when the native sugar was available.

Mr. HOLLISTER. I do not know whether it is so available or not.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is available.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. The only objection I find to it is that it does not go far enough and compel the Federal Government to buy American at all times from the date of the bill's enactment.

Oh, it is very well for the gentleman from the great State of New York [Mr. Celler] to protest against putting up tariff embargoes; but when you look at the indefensible tariff embargo on jute which the Democratic Members supported, when you look at all the pyramiding of tariff rates now in effect under the Hawley-Smoot bill under your Roosevelt allotment billion-dollar super sales tax, I think it comes with poor grace for the Democratic leaders to oppose the protective-tariff nature of this legislation.

The only fault that I find with this bill is that it does not take effect immediately after it becomes law. The American taxpayers' money is going to be expended in the next 30 days for about \$4,000,000 worth of machinery for the Boulder Dam project, and from the standpoint of the American people it is better to have that machinery manufactured in American factories, which are just about closed now, by American labor, from American raw material, than to have the machinery purchased in foreign countries, particularly in countries where the wage cost is much lower than in the United States, and in foreign countries which have saddled the American taxpayer, including American factories, with their honest war debts.

Now is the time to think of America first and American labor and American industries. I am pleased that the Democratic chairman of the committee and the Democratic author of this resolution are to-day following the leading Democratic campaigner in the last campaign, Hon. William Randolph Hearst, in his crusade to take care of America first, to take care of American industry, the American taxpayers, and American workers as against foreign nations, foreign industries, foreign workers, and foreign taxpayers.

As to the free-trade proposition which many of you Democrats are advocating, how long would American industry, agriculture, and manufactures exist if we were to compete with the 14 cents a day labor-produced goods of the Orient or the \$2 a week labor-cost goods in Europe which are now flooding the market, coming in over the Hawley-Smoot tariff rates?

I say that the Democratic Party and the new Democratic President could do nothing better for the American people and the unemployed in America than to follow the Hon. William Randolph Hearst and revise upward most of the tariff rates of the Hawley-Smoot bill so as to stop these excessive foreign importations, particularly from countries whose currencies have depreciated.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Are we exporting more than we are importing or are we importing more than we are exporting?

Mr. SCHAFER. Oh, when you take into consideration the depreciation of currency in foreign countries, we are importing more actual competitive commodities than ever in the history of the Nation. If you are going to bring the American farmer and worker down to the 14 cents a day rice-eating labor of Japan and China, God help them, if they are now in despair. If you are going to tear down our tariff walls or fail to bolster those which are crumbling, and bring the American worker and American industry and American farmers down to the level now prevailing in the Orient, with its depreciated currency, then, I say, God help America.

I sincerely hope that you Democrats who have failed to revise downward one rate of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, although you have had control of the House for two years, and have indicated that this would be a pretty good thing to do, will follow Mr. Hearst, your leading Democrat, in his stand for America first and for revising upward the present tariff rates.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this is not new legislation. The War Department and the Navy Department, under present law, have the right to eliminate from their purchases foreign-made goods. This bill, if it is passed, and I hope it will be, will permit the other departments of the Government, particularly the Department of the Interior, to exercise this right.

As you know, the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has under its control the construction of Hoover Dam. On the 3d of last December specifications were issued and bids called for by the Depart-

ment of the Interior, covering the purchase of a number of hydraulic turbines with necessary machinery and equipment for the Hoover Dam at an estimated cost of between three and three and one-half million dollars. On February 3 these bids will be opened in the city of Denver. At the same time there will be opened bids covering what is known as the cylinder type of head gates, amounting to over \$1,000,000. Within the next two or three months other bids will be opened at the same place covering electrical equipment to be connected with the turbines, which will cost approximately \$3,500,000 to \$4,000,000.

Without any question of doubt, under the present exchange conditions and the present difference in labor costs European manufacturers will be able to submit bids on all this equipment far below American manufacturers.

Several American companies have filed bids, and we know that one European company has already filed a bid. The American companies inform us that unless this bill is enacted into law before these bids are opened it is a certainty that the work will go to a European company.

May I suggest to the author of the bill or to the chairman of the committee that section 4 of the bill be amended by striking out the words "sixty days" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "immediately." [Applause.]

This is constructive legislation and should be passed immediately. All haste should be taken to send it to the Senate, where it is hoped it will receive immediate consideration and where it should be amended so that instead of taking effect in 60 days from its passage, as provided for in the bill, it should go into effect immediately.

The hydraulic turbines and necessary machinery equipment for which bids will be opened on February 3 represents 6,000 tons of equipment, each ton representing one week's work for an American mechanic or laborer. With 12,000,000 men walking the streets of this country, this work, which will be paid for by American taxpayers, should be awarded to an American manufacturer, who in turn will employ American labor. [Applause.]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, January 12, 1933.

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives, United States.

MY DEAR MR. WELCH: I have your letter of January 9 inclosing a letter from the California State Chamber of Commerce with reference to the use of foreign steel in the Hoover Dam construction.

The statement by the United Press gives a wrong impression of the attitude of the bureau and myself. We believe that all Government awards should go to American firms, but this bureau is not protected as are some of the Government departments, notably the Army and Navy, in being given authority by law to award to other than the low bidder when the low bidder is a foreign firm. Possibly my explanation of that fact led to the misunderstanding of the bureau's attitude given in the press dispatch.

It is hoped that there may be legislation that will give the Bureau of Reclamation the authority now granted to some departments to give preference to American manufacturers.

I have no knowledge of any purchases of German steel or other foreign material at Hoover Dam, but when this matter was brought to my attention I wrote to our chief engineer at Denver requesting an inquiry be made into this matter. On receipt of his reply I will communicate with you again.

I am returning Mr. Sloane's letter to you and am sending him a copy of this reply.

Very truly yours,

ELWOOD MEAD, Commissioner.

CALIFORNIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Francisco, January 4, 1933.

The Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELCH: Attached is a news report of December 20 from Washington, D. C., on the attitude of Dr. Elwood Mead, commissioner of reclamation of the Interior Department, concerning the use of foreign steel in the Hoover Dam construction.

During the period of this present emergency everything should be done to keep as many of our men as possible throughout the country employed on jobs. Certainly the purchase of foreign products in our public construction enterprises reduces to a considerable extent the possibility for employment in our American industries.

It will be appreciated if you will bring this to the attention of Doctor Mead, stressing the importance of using American

products as far as possible in all public construction work throughout the United States, in order that employment may be provided to the greatest possible number of people in this country.

This question of unemployment is a most serious problem. We have found that one of the best means for aiding unemployment is by keeping our plants operating. Your interest in having American products used as far as possible on all public work, particularly during this period of stress, will be most helpful and appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

N. H. SLOANE, General Manager.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 10743, is a rewriting of a provision of several other bills intended to provide that within a reasonable cost supplies bought for public use shall be the products or the manufacture of the United States. It is intended to foster and protect American industry, American workmen, and American invested capital, and with those principles I am in entire accord.

When a bill is presented for our consideration to be passed, if at all, under suspension of the rules no amendment is permitted unless you will give your unanimous consent. My correspondence and interview with committee members indicate that there was no objection in committee. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER] a few moments ago mentioned an objection that was never communicated to me.

Under date of April 12, 1932, the author of the bill stated over his signature:

I have conferred with the chairman and other members of the committee and can assure you that such an amendment as you propose will be acceptable to all of us.

Section 2 of the bill reads as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless inconsistent with the public interest, or unless the cost is unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States wholly of articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, or to be used for experimental or scientific purposes, or if articles, materials, or supplies of the class or kind to be used are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States.

You notice that the second sentence provides that the section shall not apply to articles, materials, or supplies "to be used for experimental or scientific purposes." I ask unanimous consent that on line 12, page 2, the following words be stricken:

Or to be used for experimental or scientific purposes.

And in line 13 there be inserted after the word "supplies" the following:

Including those to be used for experimental or scientific purposes.

So that the sentence will read:

This section shall not apply with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, or if the articles, materials, or supplies, including those to be used for experimental or scientific purposes of the class or kind to be used are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States.

This fairly protects all articles, materials, or supplies useful for experimental or scientific purposes, and ought to meet with your unanimous approval.

The manufacture of scientific apparatus in America is an industry of commendable size, which has grown from a small beginning more than half a century ago until to-day when the demand of American industry, American scientists, research workers, and educational institutions can be fully met. During and since the war the American manufacturers have been able to meet the American demand for the most excellent scientific apparatus required. The number of skilled workmen employed is far above the average for other industries because of the high proportion of labor to materials employed and because the volume of output of any

one item does not justify a large outlay for automatic machinery.

History is perhaps a bit responsible for the exception it is proposed to make in the above-mentioned bill. In the not distant past the best and greatest amount of research work was done in Europe. Incidental to this research the best scientific and experimental equipment was developed there. That situation has, however, been reversed. To-day the best and greatest amount of research work is done in the United States, and the manufacturers of the equipment used are fully able to meet all requirements and they are constantly working with the men in the laboratories to advance American science and industry.

American manufacturers are continually developing new instruments for industrial, educational, and governmental laboratories, and it is quite generally realized that advancement to-day must be along scientific lines. The scientific-instrument industry is therefore not only a commercial necessity but very vital to the public health and safety and to national preparedness. You will perhaps recall our situation upon entering the late war, with our European supplies of instruments, chemicals, dyes, and medicinal supplies cut off.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it may be apocryphal for a Republican to oppose the general principles of this bill. For 25 years there has been an effort to restrict the opportunities of the Government to buying goods exclusively of American manufacture. Under the terms of this bill I consider that the department would virtually be so hamstrung that it could not function in some instances, and, if applied as the bill directs, it would cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

I can give you a concrete example. Take the manufacture of steel. There is not a pound of steel produced in this country that does not have foreign manganese as a component part. There is manganese of a low grade in this country, about 15 per cent, that may supply a modicum of the demand. But the large steel manufacturers are compelled to buy foreign manganese from Cuba, Brazil, India, and other countries.

I will give a further concrete example. The country has not pulpwood enough to supply the needs in the manufacture of paper—newsprint paper. The departments of the country would be banned from buying any newspaper under the terms of the bill, because two-thirds of the newspapers of the country are manufactured out of pulp that is imported into this country.

Other instances have been cited. Sugar has been cited. It is well known that we have not sufficient production of sugar to meet the demands.

Gentlemen, you are going to say that we shall live by ourselves and give no consideration whatever to our neighbors so far as the purchase of their productions are concerned. You want to erect a Chinese wall and not let any manufactures or raw material come in. I have seen the principles of the tariff grow from the idea of encouraging infant industry until now the prevailing idea is a policy of self-containment; and here you have the latest expression of this tariff idea, that the Government shall not purchase any articles or goods of foreign manufacture.

You might enunciate a principle that the departments shall not buy anything that can not, within reason, be produced in this country. This bill is not that, however. It absolutely circumscribes the activities of the departments, so that they have to buy everything of American manufacture.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I think a radio has about 35 different products which come from 35 different countries.

Mr. STAFFORD. The instance given illustrates the restrictive character of this legislation. We have not advanced in our chemical production nor in our engine pro-

duction to the extent where we are self-containing and where we can rely entirely on articles of our own manufacture and as to articles that may be mined or produced in this country.

It is going to extremes when you adopt this policy, because it is not workable, and in these days of all days, we should not establish a policy when the departments are not under any circumstances violating the general principle of purchasing home-made articles.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to adopt the policy of refusing to purchase the products of foreign nations for public purposes, why should we not by law prevent our citizens from doing the same thing?

Mr. STAFFORD. Such a policy would be akin, but I am objecting to this bill because it is not practicable. I have cited the instance of manganese and of pulp, which we can not manufacture in this country in quantities sufficient to meet the industrial demands. Yet under the terms of this bill the departments would be obliged to have the steel manufacturer readjust his enterprise to the purchase of low-grade manganese and produce articles not equal to the existing character of manufactured steel. The bill is another attempt to put artificial restrictions on the freedom of manufacture and trade that is in opposition to established business and industrial practice.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will read in section 2 the words in the second line, "unless inconsistent with the public interest," I think they will find an answer to their argument. I regret very much that I can not accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], because I have no authority from the committee to accept any amendment, nor can I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GRANFIELD]. This is a House bill. It goes to the Senate, and the gentlemen can present their arguments to the Senate committee, and if the Senate committee feel that they have a good case, I am sure that they will amend the bill, and when it returns I will ask the House committee to give them a hearing if that be necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANFIELD: Page 2, line 14, after the word "used," insert "or the articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 150, noes 18.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

BETTER ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NAVY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5352) to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, is it the purpose of the Speaker to return to suspensions again this afternoon?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The information of the present occupant of the chair is that he will not.

BREAKING OF SEALS OF RAILROAD CARS, ETC.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4095) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing inter-

state or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 409-411), by extending its provisions to provide for the punishment of stealing or otherwise unlawful taking of property from passenger cars, sleeping cars, or dining cars, or from passengers on such cars, while such cars are parts of interstate trains, and authorizing prosecution therefor in any district in which the defendant may have taken or been in possession of the property stolen or otherwise unlawfully taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. Will not the gentleman from Missouri object, so that we can get somewhere with this?

Mr. DYER. I have no recollection of the bill having been considered.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will not the gentleman object so that next calendar day it will require three objections?

Mr. DYER. A hasty reading of the bill—which it seems to me is the first time that I have seen it, which may be my own fault though I do not recollect having been absent from a committee meeting—impresses me that it goes too far. I have no objection to including the theft of money from passengers or anything of that kind or of property from passengers. It goes much farther and includes games. If the gentleman will eliminate that part of it I have no objection to it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 13, 1913, as amended, entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same" be amended to read as follows:

"Whoever shall unlawfully break the seal of any railroad car containing interstate or foreign shipments of freight or express, or shall enter any such car with intent in either case to commit larceny therein; or whoever shall steal or unlawfully take, carry away, or conceal, or by fraud or deception obtain from any railroad car, station house, platform, depot, wagon, automobile, truck, or other vehicles, or from any steamboat, vessel, or wharf, with intent to convert to his own use any goods or chattels moving as or which are a part of or which constitute an interstate or foreign shipment of freight or express, or shall buy or receive or have in his possession any such goods or chattels, knowing the same to have been stolen; or whoever shall steal or shall unlawfully take, carry away, or by fraud or deception obtain with intent to convert to his own use any baggage which shall have come into the possession of any common carrier for transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to another State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or shall break into, steal, take, carry away, or conceal any of the contents of such baggage, or shall buy, receive, or have in his possession any such baggage or any article therefrom of whatever nature, knowing the same to have been stolen, or whoever shall steal or shall unlawfully take by any fraudulent device, scheme, or game from any passenger car, sleeping car, or dining car, or from any passenger or from the possession of any passenger while on or in such passenger car, sleeping car, or dining car, when such car is a part of a train moving from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to another State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, any money, baggage, goods, or chattels, or who shall buy, receive, or have in his possession any such money, baggage, goods, or chattels, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall in each case be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both, and prosecutions therefor may be instituted in any district wherein the crime shall have been committed or in which the defendant may have taken or been in possession of the

said money, baggage, goods, or chattels. The carrying or transporting of any such money, freight, express, baggage, goods, or chattels from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall constitute a separate offense and subject the offender to the penalties above described for unlawful taking, and prosecutions therefor may be instituted in any district into which such freight, express, baggage, goods, or chattels shall have been removed or into which they shall have been brought by such offender. The words 'station house,' 'platform,' 'depot,' 'wagon,' 'automobile,' 'truck,' or 'other vehicle,' as used in this section, shall include any station house, platform, depot, wagon, automobile, truck, or other vehicle of any person, firm, association, or corporation having in his or its custody therein or thereon any freight, express, goods, chattels, shipments, or baggage moving as or which are a part of or which constitute an interstate or foreign shipment.

"Nothing herein shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof; and a judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution hereunder for the same act or acts.

"To establish the interstate or foreign commerce character of any shipment in any prosecution under this act the waybill of such shipment shall be prima facie evidence of the place from which and to which such shipment was made."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 14, after the word "such," insert the word "money."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Page 3, line 14, after the word "stolen," strike out the words "or whoever shall steal or shall unlawfully take by any fraudulent device, scheme, or game."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman does not intend to strike out all of that language, does he?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Page 3, line 14, after the word "steal," strike out the words "or shall unlawfully take by any fraudulent device, scheme, or game."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I fear that perhaps there is a misapprehension on the part of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER]. In almost every State the obtaining of money by fraudulent scheme or game is larceny. It does not prohibit a game. It applies to a fraudulent scheme or fraudulent game. That is the purpose of it. The gentleman knows there are "tin horns" traveling on the trains and on the ships who are professional card sharks, who do not engage in an honest game, who have fraudulent games, marked cards, loaded dice, and so forth. The purpose is to reach those people, and we can not acquire jurisdiction because the train is moving and it is difficult to ascertain at just what site the crime was committed. I want to say this does not refer to the ordinary game. It is the fraudulent game.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. DYER. If the words "or game" are stricken, I would have no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If we strike the words "or game," then a fraudulent game would come under the term "scheme," would it not?

Mr. DYER. I do not think there would be any trouble on that. I am not serious about it, if the gentleman thinks that will be all right.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will go that far, because I think "fraudulent game" would come under "scheme."

Mr. DYER. I am in accord with the gentleman from New York, if that is so, and I withdraw the objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I offered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROP-PRODUCTION LOANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Permit the Chair to make a statement. Without objection, House Joint Resolutions 529 and 349 will be laid on the table, similar Senate bills having been passed under suspension of the rules.

There was no objection.

H. R. 10743

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill, H. R. 10743.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on Monday, January 16, 1933, H. R. 10743, "An act to require the purchase of domestic supplies for public use and the use of domestic materials in public buildings and works" passed the House. This particular piece of legislation is the beginning of what I hope will be an awakening of the American people to the possibility of what they may accomplish through their own personal effort toward bringing about a revival of business activity in our own country.

Abraham Lincoln once said, in discussing a matter such as this, that the American dollar that is spent in a foreign country remains there, while the American dollar that is spent in America, both the goods and the dollar, remain in America, thus adding to the prosperity of the people under our flag.

I rejoice to see the activity of one of the great chains of newspapers in our country, as they publish from day to day, editorials pointing out the possibility of this great self-help movement which we now call "Buy American."

Some years ago my attention was called to the use of the American Government in many places of foreign-made pottery ware. At that time I complained to the various departments of Government where I found foreign pottery were being used instead of American-made pottery ware, and my requests were met with a very happy and ready response by the officials whom I contacted, and all foreign-made ware was replaced by pottery ware made in the United States.

A few weeks ago representatives from every country under the British flag assembled in Ottawa, Canada, for the purpose of discussing what best could be done to promote the use of merchandise manufactured and produced under the British flag. The most brilliant business minds of the Empire discussed this question for many days, and out of that mingling of minds and ideas came the slogan "Buy British." Now, throughout the great English-speaking Empire a concerted movement is under way to have and buy nothing produced in any other country, save only the countries where the British flag flies.

We in America find ourselves in most distressing conditions because of the lack of employment of our people and the idleness of our factories; and, the first time in the economic history of our Nation, we find a country filled with food and clothing and all things that go to make physical life comfortable, and yet we are told that more than 10,000,000 able-bodied, willing, and strong men are unable to find employment; and because of this lack of work we find millions of men, women, and children undernourished and poorly clad in a land of plenty. We find people on the farms, for the first time in the history of our Nation, unable to produce enough to pay the interest on the debts that they owe or keep up the payment of the taxes upon which the Government operates; and so, on Monday, January 16, 1933, the National House of Representatives passed an act requir-

ing all Government officials to buy American-made materials and merchandise for the use of the Government.

Now, if all the citizens of the United States would fall in line with the suggestions made in this legislation, as well as the suggestions made by the many newspapers throughout the country who are taking an active interest in reviving business, I feel sure that before many weeks would go by many wheels of industry would be singing their sweet songs of hope into the ears of happy workingmen and our country would again be on the way to prosperity.

In the pottery industry, I am told by those best informed, that if every pottery in the United States was working six days a week and every week in the year that they could not produce within 25 per cent of all the ware that is required each year in the United States. But, unfortunately, by reason of low wages paid in all foreign countries and the unsettled values of the money standards of the various countries of the world, we find the United States importing almost 60 per cent of the pottery ware now used by our people. In the year 1932, 52 countries sent pottery products to the United States to compete with American high-class pottery working citizens. How quickly the homes of this country could overcome the present condition if they would only adopt the truly American slogan "Buy American."

I might go on indefinitely citing other lines of industry in the United States, because there is no line of manufacturing that is exempt from the blighting influence of imported merchandise. Economists tell us that in normal times the citizens of the United States consume 92 per cent of all the goods manufactured under our flag, thus leaving only 8 per cent to be sold or traded elsewhere. And yet we have one school of thought that would sacrifice this market that consumes 92 per cent of the merchandise manufactured and would let down the bars indiscriminately to other nations so that they might send their underpaid produced ware into the United States to make idle wheels in our factories.

Unfortunately for America a new class of international citizenship has come upon the scene. He is known as the international manufacturer. He votes in America; he has made his money under the flag of the United States. In the markets of the United States he has sold all that he produced at exceedingly fine profits. Not being satisfied with the profits he made in American factories, he desired to build branch factories in other countries of the world, where labor is to be had very much cheaper than the wages paid by the same manufacturer under our flag. And, with the wealth acquired by the sale of his merchandise in the United States, this new type of citizen has spent his money propagandizing our country against the welfare of our people and their happiness in their employment. Their policy seems to me to be very shortsighted, because by their very conduct they are destroying the buying power of the people of this Nation, because when our working men are idle the flow of money diminishes and business, of course, will languish.

I might go on to great lengths in this subject, but the power of the press and the readiness and willingness of many, many persons to sell their influence for a price has misled our American people on the question of tariff protection and the great market we have among ourselves.

The United States is the greatest market in the world when conditions are normal, and I have taken this opportunity to-day, on the passage of the first real constructive "Buy American" legislation, to place in the Record these few words in the hope that it may arouse patriotic pride in the bosoms of our American citizens and that our citizens will put into action and use the tool that they have with them to go about mending the economic structure of our daily lives. Will not all Americans join together and be as loyal as the citizens of the British Empire, and "Buy American"?

CLAIMS OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 127) to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44

Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. LAGUARDIA objected.

FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS, LOWELL CREEK, SEWARD, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6733) for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I find here in the original act providing for this work that a contribution of \$25,000 is to be made by the town of Seward. I would like to know if there has been any change in the situation as far as the town of Seward is concerned and if they are ready to go ahead with the proposition?

The reason I ask this, I may state to the Delegate from Alaska, is that when matters of this kind are first taken up we find a very general willingness, or expression of willingness, to contribute, but as a project is advanced to the state of actual work then there is always trouble in getting the contribution provided for in the original act.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, answering the inquiry propounded by the gentleman from New York, I may say this act of Congress was approved February 9, 1927, six years ago. All the money was expended and the amount the city of Seward had to pay has been paid and put into the improvement.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It has been paid?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It has been paid and put into the improvement long ago.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That answers the question.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the Delegate from Alaska a question in this regard. I notice the Secretary of War has approved this by letter written January 18, 1932.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I wonder if there has been any change on that side of the proposition at all as to whether the War Department is still in favor of this.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Indeed, the War Department is in favor of it. This is a War Department bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to submit for the consideration of Congress such estimates as are, in his judgment, necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska, construction under authority contained in Public Resolution No. 52, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved February 9, 1927.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF UNITED STATES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 92) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. STAFFORD. My purpose, I may say to the gentleman from New York, is to frame a substitute with the same thing in view.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman have the substitute ready the next time the calendar is called?

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope so. The substitute has the same purpose in view.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CITY OF PRESCOTT, ARIZ.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4791) to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the city of Prescott municipal watershed in the Prescott National Forest within the State of Arizona.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter mining locations made under the United States mining laws upon lands within the municipal watershed of the city of Prescott, within the Prescott National Forest, in the State of Arizona, specifically described as the west half southwest quarter section 13; south half section 14; southeast quarter, and east half southwest quarter section 15; east half, and south half southwest quarter section 22; all of section 23; west half section 24; all of sections 26 and 27; north half north half section 34; and north half north half section 35, township 13 north, range 2 west, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, an area of 3,600 acres, more or less, shall confer on the locator the right to occupy and use so much of the surface of the land covered by the location as may be reasonably necessary to carry on prospecting and mining, including the taking of mineral deposits and timber required by or in the mining operations, and no permit shall be required or charge made for such use or occupancy: *Provided, however,* That the cutting and removal of timber, except where clearing is necessary in connection with mining operations or to provide space for buildings or structures used in connection with mining operations, shall be conducted in accordance with the rules for timber cutting on adjoining national-forest land, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining and prospecting shall be allowed except under the national-forest rules and regulations, nor shall the locator prevent or obstruct other occupancy of the surface or use of surface resources under authority of national-forest regulations, or permits issued thereunder, if such occupancy or use is not in conflict with mineral development.

SEC. 2. That hereafter all patents issued under the United States mining laws affecting lands within the municipal watershed of the city of Prescott, within the Prescott National Forest, in the State of Arizona, shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, together with the right to cut and remove so much of the mature timber therefrom as may be needed in extracting and removing the mineral deposits, if the timber is cut under sound principles of forest management as defined by the national-forest rules and regulations, but each patent shall reserve to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed except under the rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. That valid mining claims within the municipal watershed of the city of Prescott, within the Prescott National Forest, in the State of Arizona, existing on the date of the enactment of this act, and thereafter maintained in compliance with the law under which they were initiated and the laws of the State of Arizona, may be perfected under this act, or under the laws under which they were initiated, as the claimant may desire.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONNET CARRE FLOODWAY AREA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13523) in reference to land in the Bonnet Carre floodway area.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in section 4 of the act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries approved May 15, 1928, "That any land acquired under the provisions of this section shall be turned over without cost to the ownership of States or local interests," shall not apply to the lands heretofore acquired or that may be hereafter acquired in connection with the construction, maintenance, or operation of the Bonnet Carre spillway and floodway. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant to any citizen, association, railroad, or other corporation, State or public agency thereof, rights of way, easements, and permits, over, across, in, and upon said lands for railway, highway, telephone, telegraph, and pipe-line crossings, and other purposes. The grants issued in pursuance of this authority shall be under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of War may deem advisable for the protection of the public interests, and may be perpetual or temporary in his discretion.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the next business on the Consent Calendar, House Joint Resolution 533, providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I recall when a similar bill was under consideration in the last Congress, granting the privilege to suspend work on these mining claims, the Secretary of the Interior represented that it would be in the interest of the Government and the country if they were required to perform their minimum of work, amounting to \$100, stating that to this extent it would relieve the labor conditions in the country. Why is it necessary that we should relieve all these mining claimants of the requirement of performing a small amount of labor, amounting to \$100 in value, so as to keep their claims alive?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, these claims are not owned by mining companies. If a mining company has a claim they can go ahead and patent it. They do not take a claim until they can get a patent. This bill refers to the hundreds of prospectors who have gone out into the hills and think they have discovered something. The law requires they shall do \$100 worth of work annually on their claims in order to obtain complete possession of them.

Financial conditions now are such that these men can not get the necessary powder and tools; and if the legislation is not enacted, thousands of these small claimants, who are now starving, will be deprived of what they think they have that will be of some value in the future.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give us first-hand information as to how much of this requirement is predicated upon an investment in powder and tools? So far as tools are concerned, I assume these prospectors have them and they will not be required to invest in any additional equipment. They have the labor as they are out of employment. Is there any additional expense entailed upon them by reason of the depression?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. A man can not go into the mountains and stay a week or ten days or two weeks working on a claim without taking what we call a "grub stake," which is our expression out there for food. Many of these men are now living on charity, and certainly we should not deprive them of what little they have in prospect. The Government does not lose a thing in the world, and the bill will just allow these men to retain whatever potential interest they may have in the premises.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I notice the bill dates from July 1, 1932, and practically six months of that time has already passed.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It occurred to me on yesterday when I was studying this bill that if there are no other objections, the gentleman might extend the time to July, 1934, so he would not have to come back here again.

Mr. STAFFORD. Unfortunately, the gentleman, like myself, is not coming back here next year.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am not either.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is a trinity of very active Members not coming back. However, I do not think we should be too presumptuous. There will always be found others who will take up our work and look after the interests of the miners when we are gone.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] ought to be given serious consideration. If the gentleman had listened to the debate when this bill was passed last June, it would have been unnecessary to come in at this time and have this change made.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say to the gentleman that I listened to the debate, but my memory is not so infallible that I remember every word that is uttered, even by the gentleman from Colorado.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than \$100 worth of labor to be performed, or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States, including Alaska, during the year beginning at 12 o'clock m., July 1, 1932, and ending at 12 o'clock M., July 1, 1933.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT GARRISON, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 13535, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Garrison, N. Dak., authorized to be built by the State of North Dakota, by an act of Congress approved February 10, 1932, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from February 10, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Amend the title so as to read "A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCK RIVER AT MOLINE, ILL.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 13852, to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rock River, south of Moline, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved June 10, 1930, to be built by the State of Illinois across the Rock River, at a point south of Moline, Ill., in section 16, township 17 north, range 1 west, fourth principal meridian, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from June 10, 1933.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "That the" and insert the word "The," and amend the title so as to read: "A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rock River, south of Moline, Ill."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS LAKE CHAMPLAIN AT OR NEAR ROUSES POINT, N. Y., AND A POINT AT OR NEAR ALBURGH, VT.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5059) to extend the time for completion of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., at a point at or near Alburgh, Vt.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., and a point at or near Alburgh, Vt., authorized to be built by Elisha N. Goodsell, of Alburgh, Vt., his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by an act of Congress approved February 15, 1929, is hereby extended three years from February 15, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the date "February 15, 1929," insert the words "heretofore extended by act of Congress approved April 19, 1930."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**BRIDGE ACROSS THE PEE DEE RIVER AND THE WACCAMAW RIVER
NEAR GEORGETOWN, S. C.**

The next business on the calendar was the bill (H. R. 13372) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C., authorized to be built by the county of Georgetown, S. C., by an act of Congress approved May 29, 1930, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "extended," strike out the word "two" and insert the word "one" in lieu thereof; line 9, strike out the word "four" before the word "years" and insert the word "three" in lieu thereof; line 9, after the word "from," strike out the words "the date of approval hereof" and insert the date "May 29, 1933."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**BRIDGE ACROSS THE ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL NEAR
TISKILWA, ILL.**

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13743) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal near Tiskilwa, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress be, and is hereby, granted to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal at a point suitable to the interest of navigation at or near Tiskilwa, Ill., in section 1, township 15 north, range 8 east, fourth principal meridian, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "Congress," strike out the words "be, and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**BRIDGE ACROSS THE ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL NEAR
LANGLEY, ILL.**

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13744) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal near Langle, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress be, and is hereby, granted to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Langle, Ill., between sections 9 and 10, township 16 north, range 7 east, fourth principal meridian, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "Congress," strike out the words "be, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT CANNELTON, IND.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5131) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., authorized to be built by the Hawesville & Cannelton Bridge Co., by an act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved May 13, 1930, and February 20, 1931, are hereby further extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, before and after the word "and," strike out the words "two" and "four," respectively, and insert the words "one" and "three," respectively; line 10, after the word "from," strike out the words "the date of approval hereof" and insert "March 1, 1933."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER, PITTSBURGH

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5183) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask a question. I note that the Agricultural Department does not interpose an objection to the Bureau of Roads. I want to get a little further information because I am anxious that we do not have any more toll bridges than possible.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. This does not connect any highways.

Mr. PATTERSON. The information I have is that the location indicated for the proposed bridge is on the system of Federal-aid highways approved for Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. It does not connect any Federal-aid highway or State highway. It is across the river between the city and the borough of Homestead.

Mr. PATTERSON. It is on a national highway, is it not?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. No; it is not.

Mr. PATTERSON. This says that it is on a system of approved Federal highways.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. There is no Federal highway or State highway. It is a street in a city.

Mr. STAFFORD. And may I interpellate, here is a grant to the board of commissioners. It authorizes them to levy tolls, but it is to be assumed that the municipality will not levy unreasonable tolls to deflect traffic from going through the city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Monongahela River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, to replace what is known as the Brown Bridge, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled

"An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT RANDOLPH, MO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5231) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo., authorized to be built by the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved May 24, 1928, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved March 1, 1929, May 14, 1930, February 6, 1931, and May 6, 1932, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from May 24, 1933.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT ST. CHARLES, MO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5232) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will this bridge be built within this time limit?

Mr. MILLIGAN. This is a railroad bridge. Of course, the railroad contemplates finishing it within this time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a new bridge already under construction by the Wabash Railroad Co. They have already expended \$882,000 of a total expenditure of approximately \$2,380,000. I have a letter here to my colleague, from the general counsel and ask unanimous consent to insert it as a part of my remarks at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WABASH RAILWAY CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., January 11, 1933.

HON. HENRY F. NIEDRINGHAUS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NIEDRINGHAUS: I wish to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3d instant, to which is attached a letter to you from Elton J. Layton, clerk of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and in reply I beg to advise as follows:

1. The plans and location for the construction of the bridge referred to in H. R. 13911 have been approved by the War Department.

2. The necessary right of way lands for the approaches to the new bridge, on each side of the river, have been acquired.

3. The river piers required in the construction of the new bridge have been constructed.

4. The grading of the railway embankment for the St. Louis County approach to the new bridge has been completed.

5. The total amount expended for the work above mentioned is \$882,000.

It is the belief of our management that if the time for the completion of the bridge shall be extended for a period of two years, the business conditions of the country will be improved to such an extent as will enable them to complete the bridge structure

within the extended period at an estimated additional cost of \$2,380,000.

I was pleased to receive a telegram yesterday from Senator HAWES advising that the Senate bill had been passed and referred to the House Committee of Interstate Commerce.

Thanking you for your continued attention to this matter, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

N. S. BROWN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo., authorized to be built by the Wabash Railway Co., its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved February 7, 1930, is hereby extended to February 7, 1935.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER, MARION COUNTY, MISS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5260) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Pearl River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is going to offer an amendment which will not in any way affect the principles involved.

Mr. RANKIN. It will not.

Mr. MILLIGAN. What is the amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. This bill gives authority to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., to construct a free bridge across Pearl River. My amendment is to add after the word "Mississippi" "and the Mississippi State Highway Commission." The State highway commission has charge of the construction of the bridge. It does not in any way alter the effect of the bill except to clear up that question.

Mr. MILLIGAN. The State highway commission will aid in the construction of the bridge?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection, and the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge and approaches thereto across the Pearl River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Columbia, in the county of Marion, in the State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "free," insert the word "highway," and on page 9, strike out the word "the" where it occurs the second time and insert the word "an."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Line 4, page 1, after the word "Mississippi," insert the words "and the Mississippi State Highway Commission."

The amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pearl River at or near Columbia, Miss."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MISS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5261) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Tombigbee River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., and their successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Old Cotton Gin Port, in the county of Monroe, in the State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Tombigbee River at or near Old Cotton Gin Port, Miss."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Line 4, page 1, after the word "Mississippi," insert "and the Mississippi State Highway Commission."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are we to understand that the State highway commission constructs these highway bridges in conjunction with the board of supervisors of the respective counties?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that on a 50-50 basis, or what arrangement is made for the State to cooperate in the construction?

Mr. RANKIN. I think in this case the State highway commission has practically exclusive control.

Mr. STAFFORD. My query is directed to the question as to whether the highway commission constructs the bridge or whether the board of supervisors construct the bridge.

Mr. RANKIN. Ordinarily the board of supervisors does, but in these two instances it is my understanding that the State highway commission is going to construct the bridges.

Mr. STAFFORD. If that is the case, the bill should be changed so as not to take away authority from the board of supervisors. I am having difficulty in conceiving how an arrangement can be made so that the State highway commission constructs the bridge and the board of supervisors of the county works in conjunction.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know whether the State highway commission has exclusive control of the bridge. Possibly the counties contribute, but we are trying to get the commission to build it across a navigable stream, and in order to meet objections heretofore made, I have offered the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. But with the conjunction "and," if we grant authority to the board of supervisors that authority must be exercised by the board in conjunction with the State commission. If it is to be in the alternative then I suggest "and/or," so as to waive all possibility of confusion.

Mr. RANKIN. I will accept the amendment. I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to insert "/or," so that the amendment will read:

After the word "Mississippi," insert "and/or the Mississippi State Highway Commission."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER, MARION COUNTY, MISS.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings with reference to the bill (S. 5260) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Pearl River, back to the amending stage, and modify the amendment which I offered to include "/or," after the word "and."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I offer the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 1, line 4, after the word "Mississippi," insert "and/or the Mississippi State Highway Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the deficiency appropriation bill have agreed upon a report. It is now in the course of preparation. I do not know when the House will adjourn to-night, but I ask unanimous consent that if the report is not ready for filing by the time the House adjourns to-night the conference committee have until 12 o'clock to-night to file its report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire what agreement the conferees arrived at as far as providing for a congressional committee to supervise all refunds above \$5,000?

Mr. BYRNS. That is the only amendment that is returned in disagreement, and will come before the House when the conference report is taken up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER PLANT, ISLAND OF MOLOKAI, HAWAII

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 311) to approve Act No. 263 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the island of Molokai."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Delegate from Hawaii as to the reason for the proviso that has been offered, that the actual cost of reproduction or replacing the property should not be considered in the determination of this franchise?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I can explain that, I think. I believe the gentleman has misread the proviso. It does not apply to this franchise, because it is already in the franchise. I put that in several years ago in bills of this kind, because I did not want Congress to approve of that theory, and by ratifying that franchise we might have been on record as approving that theory of revaluation. It does not affect the provisions of this franchise.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, under the authority of the enabling act, we are ratifying an act of the Territorial legislature.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The franchise is there and we can not change it, but in so doing I say that does not necessarily put us on record as approving the theory.

Mr. STAFFORD. We can make a qualified approval of the franchise.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It has already been granted.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know, but to the extent authority of Congress in ratifying goes, it may carry a qualification.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. This is not a ratification; this is a modification of an existing franchise.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand. The very purpose of this bill is to have Congress approve an act of the Territory of Hawaii granting a franchise under the enabling act of the Territory. Without ratification by Congress the franchise would be without authority.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. When the matter was first before us for approval, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I pointed that out to the Delegate from Hawaii. I sought then to modify the franchise to that extent. But it was pointed out that all the negotiations had been completed and that the matter was entirely ready for consummation subject to ratification by Congress. Therefore, feeling that they had gone that far, I simply put in this proviso and reservation to make it clear that in so doing we did not necessarily approve this theory of valuation.

Mr. PATTERSON. I think the bill is safeguarded.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly approve of the principle incorporated in the proviso.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., The act No. 268 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the island of Molokai," passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and approved by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii on April 30, 1931, is hereby approved: *Provided*, That the authority in section 16 of said act for the amending or repeal of said act shall not be held to authorize such action by the Legislature of Hawaii except upon approval of Congress in accordance with the organic act: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as an approval by Congress of the theory of establishing value on the actual cost of reproducing or replacing property as contained in section 18 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN BANDS OF INDIANS IN UTAH

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12651) for the relief of the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians of Utah, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am either entirely right or I am entirely wrong on this bill, and this is what I would like to know and understand.

As I understand it, this money of the Ute Tribe belongs to the tribe for land purchased by the United States Government. I looked up the statute yesterday. It was not in my office, so I could only get it from the Congressional Library. If that be so, it seems to me it comes with very bad grace for the Government to plead that the doing of this thing, the paying of their money at this time, is contrary to the financial program.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. The money is already in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And it belongs to the tribes.

Mr. COLTON. It belongs to the tribes. The only objection that has been made to the bill is that it proposes to use money that has already been appropriated. I can not understand the objection myself.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think it is not only wrong but highly improper to raise that objection.

Mr. COLTON. The Bureau of Indian Affairs favors it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I said that.

Mr. COLTON. These Indians are the owners of this money, and it is inconsistent that such objections should be made to their use of it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I think he will reach the same conclusion I did when he examines the authorities.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say, in justification of my position, that all yesterday afternoon I was in a committee meeting, which prevented my having access to the statutes in my office. This is the reason I make this unanimous-consent request.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin I believe I can furnish him any information regarding this bill he wishes. The equities in the matter are all with the bill. They are very apparent. It seems to me there can be no objection to the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know there is no question but what the gentleman can supply me with valuable information, but I would like to have the bill go over without prejudice, notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is the thirteenth birthday of prohibition? Strangely enough, the Democratic Party was going out of power when prohibition was coming in. Now, with prohibition going out, the Democratic Party is coming back to officiate at the obsequies. The country did not pay very much respect to prohibition when it was alive, but it occurs to me that it would not be proper for us to adjourn to-day without paying our respects to prohibition now that it is dead. Mr. Speaker, just for the RECORD I call to your attention the last anniversary prohibition will ever have in our time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HANCOCK, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. YATES, indefinitely, on account of illness.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EX-PRESIDENT COOLIDGE

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address delivered at the memorial service commemorating the late Calvin Coolidge at the Washington Cathedral, Sunday, January 15, 1933. The address was delivered by the Right Rev. James E. Freeman, Bishop of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not, because I am in hearty accord with that splendid address, but I make the reservation merely to call the attention of my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the fact that neither the eighteenth amendment nor prohibition are dead, but both are very much alive; that prohibitionists have merely been asleep, but they are fast awakening; that instead of prohibition being dead, it is going to be alive when his great-grandchildren have great-grandchildren.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Right Rev. James E. Freeman at the memorial service commemorating the late Calvin Coolidge, at Washington Cathedral, on Sunday, January 15, 1933:

To the people of the United States the President of the Republic is the Chief Executive, they see and appraise him from afar; to

the people of the Capital he is a friend and neighbor. Though his tenure be brief, at most eight years, he moves among us as our first citizen, the exponent of domestic as well as public policies. His voice is familiar to us, his stately home constitutes the center and heart of our family life. Washington, to our fellow citizens throughout the country, is their Federal Capital; to us it is the fair city of our intimate contacts and fellowships.

It is this that makes the daily story of the life and activities of our public men, as well as the life and activities of the representatives of foreign governments in a peculiar sense a matter of personal interest to all our people. Shall we not venture to say that our judgments of our Presidents are more kindly and more generous by reason of this intimacy? The world outside is at times stern and unjust in its criticism and censure. The burdens, all too heavy, that the Chief Executive carries, are rendered more exacting by reason of this. We of America have a rare capacity for deeds of generosity; when crises arise we respond to the cry of distress with prodigal expressions of sympathy. We are less generous in our expressions when we appraise the work and worth of those whom we elevate to our highest office. The white light that beats upon a throne leaves its scorching marks that destroy vitality and sap the reserves of the strongest. Too often our chosen leaders break under the strain we impose upon them. The vigor of robust manhood yields to cares of office and unfurrows the brow and heart with seams that deplete and render uncertain the vital things of health. It is only when death stills the heart that we become sensitive to the inconsistency of our judgment and regard with high praise the sacrifices of our great public servants.

We mourn to-day a former President who but four years since moved among us, moved among us in what seemed the vigor and action of one destined to a long period of well-earned rest and refreshment. Calvin Coolidge seemed like one upon whom care rested with lighter touch than upon other men. By temperament and long practiced habits of simple living we deemed him one to whom longevity was assured. Where other men were tense he seemed relaxed and serene. Where others betrayed the strain of nerve and muscle he was calm and sustained no lack of poise. His quiet, his self-containment, his simple ways we appraised as assets that constituted his capacity to endure. His very manner of life, his habits of reflective silence, his evident regard for economy in the spoken word, his plain and wholesome ways of living—these gave him a place of unique distinction in a world made monotonous by the practices of mediocrity. The hurrying, noisy, variety-seeking crowd left undisturbed his habits of retirement and reflection. Here was a combination of thoughtful, carefully considered planning, coupled with a capacity to act with firmness of decision where both were indispensable to accomplishment.

In some respects this President possessed to a rare degree these elements that we of America esteem and appraise most highly but in our daily habits diligently ignore. We are a quick, impulsive people; in part this constitutes one of our outstanding and most appealing characteristics. When in such a man as Calvin Coolidge we observe the reserve, the patience, the genius for deliberative action, we bestow upon him our admiration and high praise. May it not be that he came to his exalted office when these excelling gifts were most sorely needed in our life as a people. The shadows of a great war had not been dissipated. We were engaged in setting our house in order and restoring to our people the quiet ways of normal living. Reacting from the strain which a great conflict had imposed, we were given to ways of excess and nervous excitability characterized our course. The calm, dispassionate man in the White House was unaffected by these passing tendencies. The clamorous cries of those who espouse the cause of internationalism left him undisturbed. He was of America. He bore no trace of foreign lineage. In a sense he was sui generis. His bearing, his mien, his voice, gave eloquent testimony to his New England background.

On one occasion after a summer sojourn in a Western State he admitted to me the provincial characteristics that are inevitably associated with down-east traditions. He readily saw their limitations as well as their elements of strength. He not only confessed their limitations but his determined and consistent endeavors to resist and live beyond them. Place of birth and the narrowing influence of environment could not restrict his horizons or determine the bounds of his loyalty. He saw and cherished the Nation in its broad sweep of territory and in the diversity of its ever-multiplying population. He outgrew the confines of his dearly loved Vermont, and with comprehensive vision saw the glory of a union that in its wide extent embraced 48 sovereignties bound together by ties of kinship, loyalty to a common purpose, and dedicated to the cause of liberty. In a striking way he illustrated the capacity of a man to outgrow the restrictions which environment and local usage enforce with strange and compelling insistence.

To many he was a man of mystery. His freedom from the dramatic and spectacular, his avoidance of that which is showy and bizarre led unthinking people to regard him as lacking in the elements of popular favor. Notwithstanding this erroneous impression he appealed to the imagination in a manner seldom approximated by those who have filled his seat of power. In retirement as in leadership his course remained consistently the same. Calvin Coolidge at all times pursued the even tenor of his way. For these things we revere him and give him place among those who have rendered notable service to the Republic. Any survey of his life that does not reckon with his background, early training, and deep religious convictions must prove inadequate and unsatisfying. As Lincoln to the end of his life bore the distinctive marks of his early environment and homely ways,

so Calvin Coolidge carried to his latest day the ineffaceable marks of his New England heritage.

There is something that inheres in those who were born and reared in these earlier States of the Union that is suggestive of the wholesome simplicity and rugged worth of the fathers of the Republic. To these stalwart sons life has ever been a serious matter, its stern disciplines are indispensable to character development and devotion to a well-defined course is always commanding and imperative. In a peculiar way this was true of him whose loss we mourn to-day.

Mr. Coolidge was essentially governed in his thinking and in his judgments by a deep religious faith. To examine his public utterances confirms this conviction. Receptive to the opinions of others, a keen observer and an incomparable listener, he reserved his judgment until it had been tested and weighed by standards that were as real to him as the ether he breathed, and these standards were not those of the capricious modernist who sacrifices old truths to be en rapport with the thought and practices of a new age. In one of his latest communications to a friend he expressed the conviction that he could not adjust himself to ways and tendencies that were out of consonance with long-cherished ideas and ideals.

No word that we might utter could more thoroughly or conclusively convey his mental reactions than these sentences taken from a letter he wrote me in September, 1923. Speaking of the high function of the church and its essential place in the economy of life, he says: "This work is to be commended because it represents the foundation of all progress, all government, and all civilization. That foundation is religion. Our country is not lacking in material resources and though we need more education, it can not be said to be lacking in intelligence. But certainly it has need of a greater practical application of the truths of religion. It is only in that direction that there is hope of the solution of our economic and social problems. Whatever inspires and strengthens the religious belief and religious activity of the people, whatever ministers to their spiritual life is of supreme importance. Without it all other efforts will fail. With it, there lies the only hope of success. The strength of our country is the strength of its religious convictions."

More prophetic and significant are these words to-day than when they were written. Again he said in a later and notable address: "If the bonds of our religious convictions become loosened the guaranties which have been erected for the protection of life and liberty and all the vast body of rights that lies between, are gone." These words bear striking resemblance to those of Washington in his Farewell Address.

On such an occasion as this where we are met to pay loving tribute to this high-minded son of the Republic we do well to give serious heed to a message that is pertinent to conditions which confound and confuse our people. We can not believe he spoke without long pondering the dangers that might threaten the Nation should apostasy be its chosen course. It is worthy of our observation that the outstanding leaders of the Republic, especially in days of crisis, have inevitably admonished their countrymen of the perils that attend an abandoned religious faith and practice. Possibly of nothing do we need to be reminded more frequently in these trying days. We have grown to such proportions, our inventive genius is so great, our capacity to ride out storms so amazing, that there is increasing danger we shall forget the true sources of our peace and our continuing security.

Mr. Coolidge's fine Americanism, his complete devotion to customs and usages long tried and tested by experience, his utter honesty and freedom from sham and deceit, make his name a synonym for the best that we hold and treasure as a people. Like one who in other days held his high place he believed that a public office is a public trust. So long as we give such men our confidence and support will the ship of state be safely guided. So long as we can maintain the wholesome, simple ways that distinguished his career will our social and economic structure remain unshaken by the whims and conceits of an ever-changing and superficial public opinion. There are sinister shadows on our horizons that sooner or later we must dissipate. We shall not do so if we become lax and loose in our loyalties or esteem lightly the well-conceived principles upon which the Republic was builded. It takes strong men, men of vision and men of faith in God, to preserve to us the rich inheritance that was bought with a great price. Only as we resist and overcome forces inimical to our traditions and ideals shall we emerge upon a new day of happiness, prosperity, and peace.

If from what to our vision seems his untimely death we can take fresh courage, renewed hope, and a determination to mend our ways we shall assure ourselves and the world about us, that Calvin Coolidge has not lived and died in vain. No words of ours can add to or subtract from his distinction. In life he sought not praise and repelled all forms of adulation. His place is secure in the pantheon in which we enshrine the names and deeds of the good and the great.

We pause to-day in the hurried movements of life to view afresh this singular example of sterling manhood that came to us from the granite hills of old Vermont. He passed across the stage and on it won the highest distinction that a mighty Nation could confer. He was different, wholly different from other men. Among our Presidents he occupies a place altogether his own. His subtle wit, his aphoristic utterances, his habits of silence, his simple New England ways, his capacity to absorb and make use of the judgments and opinions of others, his fixity of conviction, and his definiteness of decision—these were his distinguishing marks and characteristics.

As he recedes from us he will grow in stature. Stories, incidents, yes, legends will accumulate and be identified with his name; but beyond all that men may say or write concerning him, his life and deeds will be chronicled and registered in the memory of a grateful people, and more particularly in the hearts of those who, here in the Capital, will hold him in their affections as a friend and neighbor whose life and example were those of a Christian gentleman upon whose shield no stain or blemish found repose. Calvin Coolidge, President and loyal citizen—hail and farewell!

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 17, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 1933, as reported to the floor leader:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

(10.30 a. m., caucus room, House Office Building)

H. R. 13997, to provide revenue for the District of Columbia by taxation of nonintoxicating liquors.

MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

(10 a. m.)

Continue hearings on S. 4491, to regulate intercoastal carriers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 13655. A bill to amend the act of May 10, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the times and places for holding court for the eastern district of North Carolina" (45 Stat. 495); without amendment (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Accounts was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14113) for the relief of A. H. Powell, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 14261) to provide warrant officers of the Coast Guard parity of promotion with warrant officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 14262) to amend section 3392 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 14263) to amend paragraph D of section 201, title 2, of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 14264) to empower judges to grant a limited moratorium in foreclosure proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIETERICH: A bill (H. R. 14265) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to public-school districts to aid in the maintenance of public schools and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14266) to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Ouachita National Forest in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 14267) providing for loans or advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its regional credit corporations, to farm mortgagors to enable them to lower the rate of interest on their farm-mortgage loans and to secure the postponement of the fore-

closure of farm mortgages for a period of two years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 14268) for the protection of life and property through the regulation of speed of vessels navigating on certain harbors and other navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of Oregon: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 558) to effectuate a compromise and settlement of rental leases on Sand Island in the Columbia River in Oregon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POU: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 559) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1933; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 14269) granting a pension to William J. Lindsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14270) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Rutherford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 14271) for the relief of Flensburger Dampfercompagnie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14272) granting a pension to Mary C. Learned; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 14273) for the relief of Louis E. Rotterman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 14274) for the relief of George A. Owen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 14275) for the relief of Barney Cyganek; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 14276) granting a pension to Margaret Ann Kirtley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART: A bill (H. R. 14277) to provide an appropriation for the payment of claims of persons who suffered property damage, death, or personal injury due to the explosion at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N. J., July 10, 1926; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14278) granting a pension to Iner R. Holmquist; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9591. By Mr. BOILEAU: Petition signed by various citizens of Waupaca, Wis., urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country, and count only American citizens, when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9592. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Axel Ryden, 609 North Seventh Street, De Kalk, Ill., and 14 others, calling upon Congress to enact the proposed Sparks-Capper stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9593. By Mr. CONDON: Petition of Mary M. Schiffman, Annie E. Smith, William A. Cooke, and 273 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against any repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9594. Also, petition of Lloyd W. Rounds, William Martin, F. W. Booker, and 240 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against any repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or

dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9595. Also, petition of Almon H. Medbury, Alphicle Sutherland, James E. Cheek, and 291 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against any repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9596. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Association of Army Employees of New York, urging the preservation of the citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9597. Also, petition of the Finger Lakes Wine Growers Association, of New York, urging the repeal of the eighteenth amendment by referring such issue to State convention instead of to States for legislative action, and also urging Federal control of the manufacture of all alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9598. Also, petition of the A. C. Clark Co., of New York, urging a higher tariff on Japanese tuna fish, in order to protect this industry, together with all the people connected with it in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9599. Also, petition of Bacon & Trubenbach (Inc.), of New York, urging a higher tariff on Japanese tuna fish in order to protect this industry in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9600. Also, petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, urging support of the Ransley amendment to the War Department appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9601. By Mr. GARBER: Letter of F. D. Mowbray, captain, Field Artillery Reserve, Enid, Okla., urging support of appropriations for national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9602. Also, petition of the transportation committee of the Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland, Ohio, urging support of House bill 11642, providing for ab initio repeal of the recapture clause of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9603. Also, petition of the Queensboro Chamber of Commerce, New York City, urging favorable consideration of House bill 11642, providing for changes in the existing rule governing rate making for the railroads, the retroactive repeal of the recapture clause, and the distribution of the processes of railroad valuation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9604. Also, petition of the North River Bridge Co., Jersey City, N. J., protesting against House bill 13461; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9605. Also, petition of State Chapter No. 347, the Railroad Employees' National Pension Association, Willard, Ohio, urging support of Senate bill 4646 and House bill 9891, railway pension bills, and expressing opposition to Senate bill 3892 and House bill 10023; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9606. Also, petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, urging amendment of the War Department appropriation bill by striking out the provision for the limitation of the amount which may be expended other than through competition with outside firms for manufacture at the Philadelphia Clothing Factory of wearing apparel for enlisted men of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9607. By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Petition of H. M. Williams and other residents of Baldwinsville, N. Y., opposing the modification of the Volstead Act and repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9608. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9609. Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against reduction of funds for the National Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9610. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Mrs. P. G. Mittler, Paul G. Mittler, Ella A. Connell, and numerous other citi-

zens of the city of Columbus, Ohio, urging favorable consideration of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9611. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Association of Army Employees, Governors Island, N. Y., favoring continuation of the citizens' military training camps for our national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9612. Also, petition of National Federation of Federal Employees, Washington, D. C., urging support of the Ransley amendment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9613. Also, petition of A. C. Clark Co., canned-food brokers, New York City, urging a higher tariff on Japanese tuna fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9614. Also, petition of Finger Lakes Wine Growers Association, Naples, N. Y., favoring modification and repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9615. By Mr. MILLARD (by request): Petition signed by citizens of Thiells and Haverstraw, in the State of New York, favoring the stop-alien-representation amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9616. By Mr. PERKINS: Petitions containing the names of 51 residents of Washington, Warren County, and 50 residents of Lodi, all of the State of New Jersey, favoring the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9617. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Finger Lakes Wine Growers Association, Naples, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, by referring such issue to State convention, also for the Federal control of the manufacture of all alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9618. Also, petition of Association of Army Employees, Governors Island, N. Y., favoring appropriations for the continuance of the citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9619. Also, petition of National Federation of Federal Employees, favoring the Ransley amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9620. Also, petition of Francis E. Fronczel, M. D., health commissioner, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the inviting of the International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to hold its eighth meeting in the United States in 1935; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9621. Also, petition of Bacon & Trubenbach (Inc.), brokers, canned foods and dried fruits, New York City, favoring a higher duty on Japanese tuna fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9622. Also, petition of A. C. Clark Co., brokers, canned foods, New York City, favoring a higher duty on Japanese tuna fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9623. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of New Jersey Republican Association of County Chairmen, favoring the immediate action on repeal of the eighteenth amendment and modification of the Volstead Act to provide relief for taxpayers and unemployment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1933

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Barkley	Bratton	Capper
Austin	Bingham	Broussard	Caraway
Bailey	Black	Bulkeley	Connally
Bankhead	Blaine	Bulow	Coolidge
Barbour	Borah	Byrnes	Copeland